Local Family Connection and Support through the First Semester of College

by

Sarah Beth Brice

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Approved March 2019 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Lauren McArthur Harris, Chair
Leah Doane
Kimberly Sluis

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2019

ABSTRACT

The transition process from high school to college can be filled with many rewards and challenges not only for students, but also for their families. As institutions have continued to evolve to support student success and retention, many universities have added or expanded parent and family program offices. While universities continue to work collaboratively with families promote student success, it is important to understand the how the needs of families may vary. One area to explore is the proximity of students to their family members and how distance may impact the transition for both students and families. A perceived problem in this study was that family members of local students were not as engaged as family members who lived outside the local area. The purpose of this action research study was to better understand and enhance the experience of local families as their students transitioned from high school to college. The study and innovation were grounded in two theoretical frameworks: funds of knowledge and Schlossberg's transition theory. The innovation developed based upon learnings from these theoretical frameworks included four elements: (a) a family guide, (b) family newsletters, (c) an online family video series, and (d) an updated parent and family website. The study was a mixed methods action research study conducted over the course of one semester. Quantitative data was collected through the use of a presurvey at the start of the academic year and a postsurvey as the semester completed. Qualitative data was collected through individual interviews with local family members. The results of this study indicated that families who participated in at least one element of the innovation reported more knowledge of campus resources, felt more supported by the

institution, and were confident in their ability to assist their student in the transition to college. Additionally, implications for practice and areas for future research were explored.

DEDICATION

The doctoral program was a journey, not just for me, but for my entire family. There were countless early mornings, late nights, hours spent reading, writing, and editing. Every step of the way, my family was there to provide words of support, hugs, childcare, coffee and chocolate.

To my parents, thank you for supporting my educational journey from the start and always pushing me to do better. You taught me to love learning and the value of hard work. It is because of both of you I have made it this far, thank you!

To my children, Klohe, Olivia, and Jack, your sweet smiles, contagious laugher, and unconditional love are my world! Every day you provided me with the drive to persist to the finish of this program.

To my spouse Jessica, thank you for encouraging me to pursue this dream. There were many highs and lows throughout the program, without fail you were there to support me through each and every one. I know it wasn't always easy, and it was most certainly not always fun, but I am eternally grateful for everything. I appreciate your willingness do everything from listen to my complaints, to proof reading papers for the millionth time. Truly, without you, I would not have finished. Thank you!

I love you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Situated Context 3

Purpose of Study and Innovation Overview 7

Research Questions 7

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 9

Funds of Knowledge 9

Schlossberg's Transition Theory 15

Implications for Study Based on Research 21

3 METHODS 23

Setting and Participants 23

Innovation 29

Research Design 35

Instruments and Data Sources 36

Timeline for Data Collection 38

Data Analysis 39

Data Validity and Reliabilty 42

4 RESULTS 46

Quantitave Results 46

Qualitative Results 78

CHAPTER Page

5 DISCUSSION 87

Summary 87

Implications for Practice 97

Limitations 100

Recommendations for Future Research 102

Reflections 103

REFERENCES 105

APPENDIX

A SURVEY PARTICIPANT REQUEST FORM 110

B FAMILY TRANSITION AND EXPERIENCE PRESURVEY 112

C FAMILY TRANSITION AND EXPERIENCE POSTSURVEY 117

D INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT REQUEST FORM 124

E INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 126

F TIMLINE OF INNOVATION 128

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Demographic Characteristics of Presurvey Participants 25
2. Demographic Characteristics of Postsurvey Participants 27
3. Demographic Characteristics of Individual Interview Participants 28
4. Family Video Topics 31
5. Family Newsletter Topics 32
6. Timeline for Implementation 33
7. Innovation Elements Connection to Theoretical Base 33
8. Codes and Themes from Qualitative Analysis of Interviews 42
9. Presurvey Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability 43
10. Postsurvey Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability 44
11. Participation in Innovation Elements 47
12. Quantity of Innovation Elements Used by Participants 47
13. Value of Innovation Elements 48
14. Family Support Comparison between Survey Results 50
15. Paired Samples Test: Family Support Questions between Surveys 51
16. Paired Samples Test: Family Support Questions in Presurvey and Participants who Used Innovation Elements in Postsurvey 52
17. One-Way ANOVA: Family Support and Innovation Element Participation 53
18. Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Family Support Questions 55

Table Page

19. Comparison of Confidence in Family Transition Support in Surveys……57

20. Paired Samples Test: Confidence in Transition Support between surveys 58

21. Paired Samples Test: Confidence in Transition Support between of Participants Who Used Innovation Elements 59

22. One-Way ANOVA: Confidence in Transition Support and Innovation Element Participation.....60

23. Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Confidence in Transition Support Questions 62

24. Comparison of Connectedness to ASU between Surveys 64

25. Paired Samples Test: Connectedness to ASU between Surveys 65

26. Paired Samples Test: Connectedness to ASU between Surveys of Participants who used Innovation Elements 66

27. One-Way ANOVA: Connectedness to ASU and Innovation Element Participation 67

28. Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Connectedness Questions.....68

29. Comparison of Campus Resource Knowledge between Surveys.....70

30. Paired Samples Test: Campus Resource Knowledge between Surveys.....71

31. Paired Samples Test: Campus Resource Knowledge between Surveys of Participants who used Innovation Elements.....72

32. One-Way ANOVA: Campus Resource Knowledge and Innovation Element Participation.....73

Table Page

33. Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Campus Resource Knowledge Questions 76

34. Qualitative Themes and Relation to Constructs 86

35. Relationship of Constructs to Research Questions 88

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The journey to from high school to college is filled with excitement, anticipation, planning, and what can feel like endless tasks. Before stepping into a classroom, most incoming first year undergraduate students attend New Student Orientation, take placement exams, register for classes, learn the layout of campus, complete financial aid paperwork, and do a variety of other tasks. Beyond just these task list items, new first year undergraduate students also begin to navigate many new, or added, responsibilities of adulthood. For some students this means living outside of their family home, being responsible for their class attendance, homework and work schedules, adjusting to the rigor of college level course work, and perhaps taking on new social and financial responsibilities. All of these changes can make for a powerful, and likely stressful, transition experience mentally, emotionally, and physically (Crede & Niehorster, 2012; Katz & Somers, 2017).

Higher education institutions are beginning to recognize the power of family involvement in the college experience to aid in the student transition process and academic success. Families are not only important for financial reasons, many schools are also turning to families as partners in the educational journey (Carney-Hall, 2008; Savage, 2007). Coburn (2006) stated "the challenge in higher education is not whether to involve parents. The challenge is to figure out how to enlist these already involved parents in our mutual goal of helping students" (p. 11).

In a national survey, 70% of university students indicated that they communicated with at least one family member "very often" during the academic year (National Survey

of Student Engagement, 2007). In another study, Junco and Mastrodicsa (2007) found that students communicated on average more than 1.5 times per day with family members. The National Survey of Student Engagement (2007) also found that students who have more frequent communication with their family members are more likely to participate in college activities and, overall, are more satisfied with their college experience. Increased family and student communication also contributes to a greater sense of well-being in students (Sax & Weintraub, 2014). These findings are powerful motivators for colleges to enlist families in the pursuit of student success.

The impact of family involvement goes beyond communication. Educators and researchers have found that students who involve their families in their collegiate experience retain and graduate at higher rates, express lower levels of stress, have a smoother transition to college, and state overall more satisfaction with their college experience (Friedlander, Reid, Shupak & Cribbie, 2007; Herndon & Hirt, 2004; Sy, Fong, Carter, Boehme, & Alpert, 2011; Vianden & Ruder, 2012; Wang & Casteneda-Sound, 2008). A national survey from 2003 found that developing and implementing parent and family programs was still a controversial topic that spurred debates at many institutions (Savage & Petree, 2015). However, in recent years researchers have recognized the impact that families play in the college experience; it is easy to understand why now many institutions are developing structured programs encouraging family involvement in the college process (Carney-Hall, 2008; Lum, 2006; Ward-Roof, Heaton, Carney-Hall, & Coburn, 2008). Programs range from family orientations and welcome activities, family weekends, family associations, parent mentor programs, and more. A quick Google

search of “college family programs” shows a plethora of opportunities for families to be more connected than ever before to their student’s college experience.

In order to meet the ever-growing need of family involvement, many higher education institutions have added parent and family program offices. According to a national survey of college and university programs (Savage, 2007), 30 years ago only a handful of institutions had parent and family program offices. In 2007, over 70% of institutions in the United States had at least one position with a title such as “parent coordinator.” Although there has been increased focus on family support in higher education, there is currently a lack of research that explores the engagement and connection of local families who are in close proximity to their students.

Building on this national context, my study examined family connection and support through the college transition process for families who had a student in their first undergraduate year at Arizona State University (ASU) and who lived in Maricopa County where the four primary on-ground campuses are located.

Situated Context

ASU is currently the largest public higher education institution in the United States. In the fall semester of 2018, ASU enrolled 73,925 students at the four campus locations in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Of that number 12,748 were new first year undergraduate students (ASU Facts, n.d.). While ASU holds many accolades, the institution is rooted solidly in its charter, which states:

> ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the

economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves (New American University, n.d.).

In order to rise to the charge of accomplishing the vision of the charter, ASU serves all academically qualified students who seek higher education at ASU. The 2018 first year undergraduate students' class was the largest in ASU history. The 2018 class included 7,939 Arizona resident students, of which 6,789 were Maricopa county residents. The Arizona first year undergraduate student population was a diverse group of students and is comprised of 53.1% of students who identifed as belonging to an underrepresented minority. Among the cohort of Maricopa County first year students, 1,901 self-identified on their admissions application as a first-generation student, approximately 28% of the group (ASU Facts, n.d.).

ASU requires all new first year undergraduate students to attend a NSO program specific to their academic college. ASU has 14 academic colleges that serve undergraduate students. Academic colleges are comprised of departments and units that directly relate to majors provided at ASU. NSO was made a requirement at ASU after years of tracking retention rates of students who attended orientation versus the students who did not attend orientation. For first year undergraduate students who entered ASU in 2017, 74.9% of students who did not attend orientation prior to starting at ASU came back for their second year. For students who did attend NSO, the retention rate was higher at 85%. This retention trend holds true if you drill down to Arizona resident students. Of Arizona resident students, 75.5% who did not attend NSO returned for sophomore year Arizona residents who did attend NSO retained at a higher rate of 86.8% (Personal communication, October 1, 2018).

During the NSO program students select their first semester classes, meet with their academic college and advisor, learn about campus resources, and begin the process of becoming a first-year undergraduate student. ASU encourages families to attend NSO with their student. At NSO, families participate in specifically designed programs to learn about resources available to their students, as well as families. The Dean of Students office hosts a discussion about common student issues to help families begin to understand what the transition process may look and feel like. Family attendance varies greatly for Arizona students compared to out of state families. Overall, 80% of incoming out of state first year students bring at least one guest to NSO. However, only 51% of Arizona resident students bring at least one family member (Personal communication, October 1, 2018). This means that 49% of Arizona families are potentially not obtaining information related to ASU supports, resources, and connecting to ASU before their student begins their first semester.

While no one has investigated and/or proven concrete reasons for the difference in NSO family attendance, there are a few potential barriers to examine: lack of understanding of importance of NSO, assumed prior knowledge of ASU since local families live in close proximity to ASU, and cost for families to attend NSO ($75 per person). Prior to this study, the communications to families related to NSO included two emails and one postcard mailed to the student's residence. These communications lacked detail and context, and families most likely would not understand the value of attending NSO based on the information provided. The simple postcard did not convey the importance of NSO and the impact that family involvement can play in a college student's journey.

Prior to this study, family members had to seek out information for themselves in order to stay connected consistently. In past years, for family members who do not attend NSO or other visit programs, communication from ASU slowed dramatically after their student began classes, limited to two emails during the fall semester. At such a critical time in their student's college journey, families can become disconnected from the institution because they are not being provided with important transitional information and resources that could benefit both the student and their families.

For over the past eight years, I have had the opportunity to work in the New Student & Family Programs (NSFP) office at ASU and currently serve as the Director of the office. As ASU has continued to grow in size, the role of the office has changed. When I began my career at ASU, the office focused primarily on NSO for first year undergraduate students. The office respected the role of families, but did not actively seek or cultivate ongoing relationships with families. While NSFP has always welcomed family members to attend NSO programs, we never sought avenues to encourage growth in family participation or programs. As a department, division, and institution, we now recognize the power of family involvement both for the student, and for ASU. In the year before the study, for example, NSFP engaged heavily in family social media channels, updated family NSO programming, and expanded family weekend.

While the growth was encouraging, a large gap still existed in connecting with families and assisting in their transition to ASU beyond NSO and a few sparse emails. The connection and engagement of local families in particular is a gap that this study addresses.

Purpose of Study and Innovation Overview

The process of becoming an ASU first year undergraduate student can feel overwhelming for both students and their families. The purpose of this study was to better understand and enhance the family experience of local families as their students transitioned from high school to college. The time period for the study was the students' first semester of college.

To engage families as partners, I developed a multi-approach innovation that I describe in depth in Chapter 3. The purpose of the innovation was to:

- Create a seamless and "warm" transfer of communication for families from prospective families, to families of current students;
- Assist families in learning and breaking down barriers surrounding the collegiate transition experience and process;
- Develop a system of support and help families to understand the resources available at ASU for both students and families;
- Help family members to develop a deeper connection to ASU.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Do families of local students feel confident in their ability to assist their students in the transition to college during their first semester?
2. Do family members of local students feel supported by ASU during their students first semester at college?

Organization of the Dissertation. This dissertation provides an overview and analysis of the action research project that was implemented to help local families navigate the college experience. Chapter 2 provides information on the theoretical lens used to understand issues experienced by families, as well provides structure in the creation of the innovation to be implemented. Chapter 3 provides information on the study methodology including participants, data, and instrument details and data analysis. Chapter 4 shares results of the data collection, and Chapter 5 synthesizes the findings and discuss limitations and future recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Framework

The transition process from high school to college can be a challenging time for both students and their families. Researchers and university staff have examined this transition process from a variety of perspectives and theoretical frameworks. This chapter examines two theoretical perspectives used to frame this study and innovation. First, I discuss the *funds of knowledge* framework and relevant research. Then, I discuss Schlossberg's *transition theory* and relevant research. Finally, I review implications for this study based on the literature.

Funds of Knowledge Framework

Researchers developed the funds of knowledge framework in the early 1990's as an educational framework based upon anthropological studies of Mexican American families in the Southwest (Kiyama, 2010; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Rios-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt, & Moll, 2011). Researchers initially conducted ethnographic research to understand family structure and networks, as well as to learn how families share their knowledge with each other and their communities. This research provided a better understanding of how families used information to compensate for perceived and real economic disadvantage (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2014; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). What researchers discovered was that families developed incredible bodies of knowledge and skills from their work and labor/productive activities. Moll (1992) noted extensive knowledge around farming, construction, transborder transactions, and more. An individual's funds of knowledge extend beyond their personal learning; the true power of

the funds of knowledge theory lies in the shared knowledge that individuals and networks create in communities. As individuals accumulate personal knowledge, they share this knowledge within their family, and also with their greater community network. Communities then begin to accumulate knowledge and grow skills that aid in both household or individual functioning and well-being (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2014; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012).

Studies utilizing funds of knowledge theory. Since the 1990's and the introduction of the funds of knowledge theory, researchers have conducted dozens of studies using the funds of knowledge framework. Many of these studies have looked at how people use funds of knowledge in education, particularly how educators can connect academia to student and family lives. Below I review three studies using the funds of knowledge framework to examine college entrance, transition, and persistence.

A study by Kiyama (2010) examined college aspirations of Mexican American students through the lens of educational ideology and the funds of knowledge framework. Her study dove into learning about the educational ideologies of families to better understand the context of the family's educational philosophies, processes, and aspirations. The families in Kiyama's study were participants in a university parent outreach program at a large research institution in the Southwest. This particular parent outreach program worked with families who had children in grades K-5. The majority of the participants in the study self-identified as low to low-middle class Mexican American families who did not hold a college degree. In this study, Kiyama conducted qualitative

research in the form of pre- and post-interviews, as well as in-depth case studies with six families who participated in the program.

Kiyama's (2010) study found that Mexican American families who participated in the study highly valued education. Their educational ideologies also served as a positive force within their families. While most of the parents had not attended college themselves, their knowledge and communities provided them with some information about college opportunities and choice. For example, families were able to learn from other family members who had children who went to college, or from friends or family who had gone to college themselves. Those family members served as resources for questions, as well as a positive role models. Another interesting finding by Kiyama was that many families' knowledge of higher education institutions was not necessarily rooted in academics, but came from the visibility of university athletics. She shared a story of a family whose student had aspirations to attend University of Michigan through exposure on television to their football team and marching band. The student took the time to learn how to play the fight song, and her family assisted her by helping her to look up more information online.

Based on her findings, Kiyama (2010) saw value in university staffs' continual press to involve families into their students' educational journey. However, she cautioned that staff need to take a step back to examine their understanding and perspectives before creating programs. Kiyama stressed the importance of helping families to understand and acknowledge their own resources and information. Institutions and university staff should aim to help families feel more confident in their abilities to assist their students in the college selection and going process. These

institutions and practitioners can assist families to understand their own knowledge, so they can feel empowered in the process and assist their student along the college journey.

Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz (2014) conducted a study in Texas also utilizing the funds of knowledge theory as their base framework. In their study titled "*Por los ojos de madres*: Latina mothers' understandings of college readiness," researchers conducted a qualitative study of 30 Latina mothers to learn about their perception and roles in preparing their student for college. Researchers focused on knowledge through the perspective of mothers as "teachers" in their households, as well as the role that Latino/a family's take on as educators in their homes. Researchers posed two research questions for the study. First, how do Latina mothers perceive the notion of college readiness and second, what do Latina mothers perceive as their role in helping students to be college ready?

Researchers found several themes through analysis of their data. First, researchers discovered that these Latina mothers believed that being college ready meant being academically prepared, as well as possessing individual characteristics, such as being responsible, that would allow their student to be successful in college. Additionally, data showed that Latina mothers felt their role in their students' collegiate journey was twofold: providing emotional support and financial assistance.

The stories and information shared by the mothers helped researchers to identify many aspects of college readiness that could be improved for Latino/a students and their families. The mothers in the study had a strong desire to assist their student in preparing for college, but stated that "these mothers, like other parents, are clearly not considered as key holders of knowledge and true partners in these efforts by schools and other scholars"

(Cortez, Martinez, & Saenz, 2014, p. 894). Without the academic knowledge and partnership from their student's school, the mothers tended to focus more on providing personal and emotional support to their student. Based on their findings, researchers recommended the following three components to increase Latino/a family participation in the college readiness process: (1) engage all stakeholders in defining what college readiness looks like, (2) make college readiness materials more culturally accessible to Latino/a and first-generation families, and (3) focus on harnessing Latino/a families' knowledge.

Kiyama and Rios-Aguilar (2012) provided ideas to understand how the funds of knowledge framework could be used to examine Latino/a students' transition to college. Kiyama and Rios-Aguilar shared background information on how traditional sociological and economic theory examines issues in Latino/a student transition. Both approaches tend to look more at deficiencies, including monetary, academic preparedness, or family knowledge deficiencies. Kiyama and Rios-Aguilar then provided concepts on how funds of knowledge could be used as a positive framework. The examples provided in the article centered on college preparedness and selection, as well as the formation of career aspirations.

I chose funds of knowledge theory as a framework for this study for multiple reasons. As referenced in Chapter 1, over half of first year students at ASU identify as belonging to an underrepresented minority group. The funds of knowledge framework and much subsequent research was developed studying a Latino/a population, making it applicable to a sizable portion of families in this study.

There has also been recent research that has applied the funds of knowledge framework to other educational settings and populations. In countries such as New Zealand and Denmark, schools are utilizing the concepts in the funds of knowledge framework to develop curriculum and enhance the learning environment for children (Hedges, Cullen & Jordan, 2011; Mcdevitt, 2016; Rodriguez, 2013; Virtue, 2006). Hedges, Cullen, and Jordan (2011) suggested that educators need to take more time to interact with students' families and their communities. By learning more about knowledge and interests from their family and community perspective, educators could develop more dynamic curriculum that could tap into or connect with the students on a greater level. This could then enhance student learning and connection to the classroom, increasing knowledge, and retention. Other studies have used the funds of knowledge framework to increase the retention and persistence rates of refugee and immigrant students (Mcdevitt, 2016; Rodriguez, 2013; Virtue, 2006). While the funds of knowledge framework was initially born out of studies of Latino/a families, educators and researchers are finding the concepts in the framework can and does apply other communities and families. Given the diverse first year student population at ASU, I believe that tapping into students and families communities, as well as their knowledge could have positive and supportive results for both students and their family members.

When examining the problems identified in Chapter 1 through the funds of knowledge framework, it is evident that ASU's family communications and lack of family involvement were not enabling families to connect to their own knowledge or to ASU. Kiyama (2010) suggested that practitioners and institutions help families to think and connect with the knowledge they already possess to help build their confidence. The

sparse communications prior to the study and the lack of accessibility of the communications may in fact have the opposite effect and cause a greater disconnect. Additionally, the lack of programming or opportunity for families to learn and connect with peers may have hindered the development of more community knowledge.

Schlossberg's Transition Theory

Nancy Schlossberg's development of transition theory began in the early 1980's. Her early research, books, and articles were rooted in the counseling field and sought to understand and work with adults in transition (Evans, Forney, Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Goodman, Schlossberg, & Anderson, 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg, Waters, & Goodman, 1995; Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989). Since her 1981 publication on counseling adults in transition, Schlossberg has continued to update, expand, and add to her body of work related to working with individuals in transition.

Schlossberg has defined a transition as "any event or non-event that results in a change in assumptions about oneself and the world and thus requires a corresponding change in one's behavior and relationships" (p. 4, 1981). While the wording of this definition has been slightly updated over the course of her work, the premise has remained the same. Schlossberg's work with transition theory included examining and understanding the categories of types of transition, the process of transition, as well as potential factors that could influence transition (Evans et al., 1998; Schlossberg, 1981; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995).

In Schlossberg's work with transition theory, she has identified three types of transition: anticipated, unanticipated, and non-event (Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg et al., 1989). An anticipated transition is

defined as a planned transition in which an individual has prior knowledge and planning time for the transition, for example graduation from high school. An unanticipated transition is when a transition or event occurs that was not planned or scheduled and are typically unpredictable. Unanticipated transitions are often caused by traumatic or crisis events such as an accident, being the victim of crime, losing a job, or death of a loved one. The very nature of unanticipated transitions means that no planning or preparation has been done for the transition, which typically means that little to no resources are in place to manage the transition smoothly. The last type of transition is a non-event transition. A nonevent transition happens when an individual anticipates an event to occur, however, the event does not occur. Examples of this type of transition could be expecting to receive a position that is not obtained or not being admitted to college or graduate school. This type of transition can be particularly impactful to the way an individual views themselves (Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995).

Schlossberg also identified that beyond the specific type of transition an individual is experiencing, it is also critical to the context and impact of the transition (Evans et al., 1998; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg et al., 1989). Schlossberg viewed the context of a transition to be the setting in which the transition is occurring or factors that influence the transition, as well as the individuals relationship to the transition. Factors the influence a transition include, but are not limited to, an individual's gender identity, financial means, race/ethnicity, and the specific geographic location. It is also important to understand the setting in which the transition is occurring in, for example is visibility of the transition (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg et al., 1989; Schlossberg et al., 2006).

Schlossberg (1981) stated that "a transition is not so much a matter of change as of the individual's perception of the change" (p. 7). A transition can have a profound impact on an individual's perception of the transition. To understand the impact of a specific transition, Schlossberg suggested that is important to understand how a transition changes an individual's daily life and how they perceive the context of the transition. Additionally, it is important to understand how a transition changes an individual's roles, assumptions, routines, and personal relationships (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg et al., 2006).

Transition occurs over a span of time and has phases. Schlossberg viewed the time frame of a transition in three phases (Schlossberg et al., 1995; Schlossberg et al., 1989). *Moving in* is the start of the transition, either plan, unexpected, or perhaps from a non-event. During this phase an individual might be learning a new environment or role, or perhaps the initial adjustment to the loss of a role. The next phase of a transition is *moving through*. In this phase an individual is adapting to changes and learning to managing new roles, responsibilities etc. The final stage is termed *moving out.* The moving out phase is the end of a transition. Often the moving out phase may be the start of a new transition, such as leaving high school to begin college or enter the work force.

In addition to type and timing of transitions, Schlossberg identified four major areas that could be potential assets or liabilities for an individual as he/she works through a transition (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995). These four areas are referred to as the 4 S's: situation, self, support, and strategies. *Situation* refers to factors related to the transition such as an individual's control over the transition, the timing, role changes, duration of

transition, and additional stress. *Self* refers to an individual's personal characteristics and psychological resources available during the transition. *Support* includes the type of support an individual has available to them during the transition, such as family, peers, coworkers, and friends. The final area is *strategies*. This area includes an individual's resources for coping with the transition such as their ability to modify the situation or manage the stress of the transition (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995).

Studies utilizing transition theory. As transition theory has continued to be developed and fine-tuned since the early 1980's, many researchers have used Schlossberg's transition theory to examine and understand the transition to and through college. Below I review two studies that used transition theory.

Tovar and Simon (2006) conducted a study titled *Academic Probation as a Dangerous Opportunity: Factors Influencing Diverse College Students' Success*, with 315 California community college students who were on academic probation. The researchers noticed that many of these students lacked academic preparation and financial resources, and also had increased family obligations. A disproportionate number of the minority first semester students, particularly Latina/o students, struggled with balancing academic work and family responsibility and were on probation by the end of their first semester. The research questions were: (1) College wide, do students of different ethnicities and gender differ in their levels of academic success (i.e., probationary status)? and (2) Do probationary students from different backgrounds differ in reported levels of academic motivation, general coping, and/ or receptivity to support services as

measured by the College Student Inventory (CSI)? If so, to what degree? What consequences (positive and negative) do they face?

Using Schlossberg's transition theory as framework, Tovar and Simon (2006) developed a "reorientation" program for students on academic probation. The majority of the participants in the study were part time students ages 22 and under. The majority, 82%, were also classified as minority students, the largest population being Latino/a (39%). The participants all completed a two hour reorientation program that included information and small group discussions designed for students who were struggling with the transition to college and academics. Participants also completed two instruments used to better understand their transitional and academic issues, the College Student Inventory and a demographic questionnaire. After the reorientation and instruments were completed, students met individually with counselors to work through any specific challenges or issues they were facing.

Based upon their results, the researchers concluded that Latino/a students on probationary status were more likely to experience academic and social difficulties compared to their White or Asian peers (Tovar & Simon, 2006). While the Latino/a students in the study often displayed more transitional issues, they also had a much more favorable impression and attitude in working with faculty and staff which is a positive factor in successfully managing the transition to and through college. Based off their findings, the researchers suggested that professional advisors and college staff could provide a supportive environment for at risk populations and also be trained to understand and use transition theory in working with students.

Griffin and Gilbert (2015) used transition theory as a framework for their study examining the barriers and support for veterans as they transitioned from the military to collegiate life. Their qualitative study posed two sets of research questions. First, how do institutions aim to provide veterans with assets or resources to facilitate their transition, particularly in relation to situation, self, support, and strategies? Second, what challenges do institutional agents face as they aim to promote successful transitions for student veterans? What challenges do institutions introduce or perpetuate in relation to veterans' institutional transitions? How are institutional efforts to increase veterans' assets challenged or limited?

The qualitative study included individual and group interviews with 72 staff, administrators, and current veteran students across seven different higher education institutions (Griffin & Gilbert, 2015). After data analysis was completed, researchers found three predominant implications. The first implication found that it was crucial that support systems around the university understand and meet veteran students' unique needs and issues. The second implication was the need for campuses to develop policy and procedures around veteran benefits to provide consistency and better information sharing. The third implication was to develop a strong veteran student presence in the study body and for veteran students to develop more quality relationships with students, faculty, and staff on –campus to provide better support. These three implications could be further developed and explored on campus locations around the country to provide better, and more meaningful, support for veteran students as they transition from service to campus.

Reviewing the issues identified in Chapter 1 through transition theory, it was evident that ASU's prior family programs and communications were lacking meaningful information that could help families learn about the transitional support available at the institution. If families are not connected or engaged, there are few opportunity to help families understand the scale of the transition to college and how their participation in the transition could ultimately aid in their students success and a smoother family transition experience for all.

Implications for Study based on Research

I have briefly reviewed and discussed literature related to two theoretical perspectives; the funds of knowledge framework and transition theory. The two theories have many distinctions and variations, but combined could seek to help local families capitalize on their community knowledge, assist families by providing transitional information and support, as well as helping families learn to draw upon their ability to manage transitions successfully.

After reviewing the literature around both funds of knowledge and transition theory, my understanding of the theories was greatly enhanced and my perceptions radically changed. The studies involving funds of knowledge in the collegiate environment made me question how I, and as an institution, ASU defined parental and family involvement. Going back to the basics of funds of knowledge, research suggests that rather than attempt to involve parents in traditional or pre-prescribed ways, institutions should seek to identify ways that families are already involved, specifically tapping into families' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Lopez, 2001; Villenas & Moreno, 2001). González et al. (2005) pointed out that if staff and

faculty were savvy, they would be wise to draw upon families as partners in education within the school context. Additionally, the literature can help NSFP to think about how we talk about and program for families as their students enter ASU. Instead of framing communications and interactions from a deficit perspective, we should approach them in a positive, reinforcing manner utilizing the capital, knowledge, and connections that families possess.

CHAPTER 3

Methods

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology of this action research project. First, I discuss the participants and setting. Next, I share the innovation, along with a timeline of implementation. Finally, I review the research design used. The research design includes the methodology, instruments, data sources, procedures, methods of analysis, and timelines.

Setting and Participants

The setting for this study was a large urban public research institution, Arizona State University (ASU). In the fall 2018 semester, institutional enrollment for ASU topped 73,900 on-campus students. Of the student body in fall 2018, 12,748 were first time first year undergraduate students (Personal communications, 2018).

I recruited family participants for this study that had a first-year undergraduate student at ASU in fall 2018 and resided in Maricopa County in the state of Arizona. Maricopa County is the located in south-central Arizona and is home to the state capital, Phoenix, which is the sixth largest city in the United States. The population in Maricopa County in 2017 was estimated at over 4 million (About Maricopa County, n.d.), making it the fourth largest county in the United States.

The presurvey email request to participate resulted in 180 completed surveys. All participants had a first year undergraduate student who was enrolled full time in their first semester at ASU. Family participants represented students from all four Phoenix area campus locations and represented 11 of the 14 undergraduate academic colleges. Table 1

includes an overview of the demographic characteristics of the participants of the presurvey.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Presurvey Participants

Characteristic	N	%
Campus location		
Downtown Phoenix campus	17	10.1%
Polytechnic campus	10	5.9%
Tempe campus	132	78.1%
West campus	10	5.9%
Academic college		
College of Health Solutions	11	6.5%
College of Integrated Sciences & Arts	9	5.3%
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	32	19.1%
College of Nursing & Health Innovation	4	2.4%
College of Public Service & Community Solutions	3	1.8%
Herberger Institute for Design & the Arts	9	5.3%
Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering	47	28.1%
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College	5	2.9%
School for the Future of Innovation in Society	1	0.6%
School of Sustainability	0	0.0%
Thunderbird School of Global Management	0	0.0%
Walter Cronkite School of Journalism & Mass Comm	0	0.0%
W.P. Carey School of Business	39	23.3%
Unsure	7	4.1%
Students living location		
On campus (residence hall/dorm)	126	74.1%
Off campus with family	38	22.3%
Off campus in apartment/house without family	6	3.5%
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	18	10.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0%
Asian	10	5.9%
Black or African American	8	4.7%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	0.5%
White	123	72.7%
Other	9	5.3%
Highest degree earned		
High School diploma or GED	28	16.4%
Associate degree	14	8.2%
Bachelor degree	58	34.1%
Master degree	39	22.9%
Doctoral degree	21	12.3%
Other	10	5.8%

The postsurvey email request to participate resulted in 181 completed surveys. All participants had a first year student who was enrolled full time in their first semester at ASU. Family participants represented students from all four Phoenix area campus locations and represented 13 of the 14 undergraduate academic colleges. Table 2 includes an overview of the demographic characteristics of the participants of the postsurvey.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Postsurvey Participants

Characteristic	N	%
Campus location		
Downtown Phoenix campus	18	10.7%
Polytechnic campus	9	5.3%
Tempe campus	131	77.5%
West campus	11	6.5%
Academic college		
College of Health Solutions	9	5.4%
College of Integrated Sciences & Arts	2	1.2%
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	32	19.2%
College of Nursing & Health Innovation	6	3.6%
College of Public Service & Community Solutions	5	3.0%
Herberger Institute for Design & the Arts	11	5.7%
Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering	33	17.2%
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College	5	3.0%
School for the Future of Innovation in Society	1	0.6%
School of Sustainability	2	1.2%
Thunderbird School of Global Management	1	0.6%
Walter Cronkite School of Journalism & Mass Comm	5	3.0%
W.P. Carey School of Business	48	28.7%
Unsure	7	4.2%
Students living location		
On campus (residence hall/dorm)	132	78.6%
Off campus with family	31	18.5%
Off campus in apartment/house without family	5	3.0%
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	27	16.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.6%
Asian	5	3.0%
Black or African American	8	4.8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
White	122	72.6%
Other	5	3.0%
Highest degree earned		
High School diploma or GED	25	14.9%
Associate degree	13	7.7%
Bachelor degree	63	37.5%
Master degree	40	23.8%
Doctoral degree	13	7.7%
Other	14	8.3%

I conducted individual interviews to collect the final data component. All family members of Maricopa County first year students received an email request to participate in an individual interview. Only four individuals consented to be interviewed. Table 3 contains demographic information for participants of the individual interviews.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Individual Interview Participants

Characteristic	N	%
Campus location		
Downtown Phoenix campus	1	25.0%
Tempe campus	3	75.0%
Academic college		
College of Health Solutions	1	25.0%
College of Integrated Sciences & Arts	1	25.0%
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	1	25.0%
Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering	1	25.0%
Students living location		
On campus (residence hall/dorm)	4	100.0%
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino/a	1	25.0%
White	3	75.0%
Highest degree earned		
High School diploma or GED	1	25.0%
Bachelor degree	2	50.0%
Master degree	1	25.0%

I was the investigator and an active participant in this action research project. As a participant, I developed and oversaw the innovation outlined in the study. As a researcher, I was cognizant of my participant role during this study. No families were forced or coerced to participate in the study in order to avoid bias in the results. Students and families elected to participate in the study.

Innovation

To engage local families as partners in the transition process from high school to being an ASU first year undergraduate student, I developed a multi-approach innovation. With the innovation I attempted to assist families in learning and breaking down barriers surrounding the collegiate transition experience through utilization of their own skills, information, and abilities. The innovation also aimed to assist families in developing a greater understanding of the ASU experience, the resources available at ASU for both students and families, family relationship to ASU, and connecting with peer families.

In previous years, there had been no transition from admitted family communications (sent from the Undergraduate Admissions Office) to general ASU family communications. Once a student officially began their first semester at ASU, general communications from ASU to family members almost completely stopped. A vital component to the innovation was what I call a "warm transfer" of continued communications to family members. All family members who had been receiving admitted family communications were now transitioned to communications from New Student & Family Programs. This helped to ensure some level of regular and consistent contact from ASU during a vital transition period for students and their families. The innovation consisted of the following components.

Family resource guide. All families of first year undergraduate students received a parent and family resource guide early in the Fall 2018 semester. The parent family guide was an eight-page guide that contained the following information:

- Description and contact for the Dean of Students office at the metropolitan campus locations.

- Information on the parent and family monthly newsletter.
- Information on how to connect with ASU family programs and other families on social media.
- Information and registration link for Family Weekend 2018.
- Community partnership information.
- Important campus resource phone numbers and websites.

Online family video series. The online family video series included discussions filmed specifically for families of current ASU students. The title of the online family video series was "Maroon & Gold Family Connections." My primary role was the development of video topics and the establishment of sequence and timing for each video. Each month NSFP released one or more videos to engage family members in learning about various topics related to the student and family transition experience, services and resources available on campus, and opportunities for student engagement. There were two lengths of videos in the online family series. The longer online family videos (referred to as "full length") were 15-25 minutes. Full length videos were moderated by a current ASU student and included one or two ASU staff or faculty members who had expertise in the area of the discussion. The full length videos also included a current family member as a participant in the discussion. NSFP purposely included family members to provide an avenue of knowledge transfer from family to family, relating back to the funds of knowledge theory discussed in Chapter 2. The hope was that family members would be open to learning from other family members. Incoming families may see peers as more relatable and/or trustworthy than a faculty/staff member.

The second length of online family video were short videos, typically 3-6 minutes in length. The short videos were not moderated and all participants in the videos were students. Topics were focused on engagement opportunities and resources for students. The goal of the short series was to give family members quick information that they could use as talking points with their student or knowledge they could use if their student was having difficulties in the transition to college.

Table 4 contains a list of all family video topics filmed throughout the course of the innovation.

Table 4

Family Video Topics

Topic	Video Length	Month
New Chapter: Supporting your student's transition to college	Full	September
Welcome to the family: Stay connected to ASU & Traditions	Full	September
How to support your student in managing the stress of college	Full	October
Why ASU students should get involved on campus	Short	October
How tutoring & academic success programs boost students	Short	November
What to expect when your student comes home for break	Full	November
How your student can get internship ready	Short	November

NSFP released family videos through ASU family social media channels and highlighted them in each family newsletter sent via email. The parent and family website hosted a page of the family videos, including an archive of previous videos. All family videos contained subtitles in both English and Spanish. The video series was the only element of the innovation available in Spanish.

Family newsletters. An ongoing piece of the innovation was a monthly newsletter communication to assist families in learning and exploring ASU. Each monthly newsletter included timely information about important student tasks or

milestones, campus resource information, as well as information about the monthly family video(s). Two of the newsletters during the innovation also included an ASU family spotlight. The ASU family spotlight shared a brief glimpse at a family's journey at ASU. The family spotlight also provided a tip(s) to other families about navigating the college transition or journey. Table 5 includes a list of a variety of the topics covered in the Family Newsletters over the course of the innovation.

Table 5

Family Newsletter Topics

Topic	Month
Family weekend information and registration information	September
Health services information and resources	September
How to find parent and family resources	September
Importance of student involvement	September
Monthly Marron & Gold family video overview	September, October, November
Academic calendar and important dates each month	September, October, November
Scholarship search portal and resources	October
Homecoming traditions and engagement opportunities	October
Community service and connection to the classroom	October
ASU family spotlights	October, November
University housing and winter break information	November
Development through student employment	November
Career night and career readiness resources	November

Parent and family website revision. As part of the innovation, NSFP revised the parent and family website to include information for families on transition topics, resource information and links to current and past newsletters, archives of family chats, and current news from ASU.

Table 6 contains the monthly timeline for the implementation of the innovation.

Table 6

Timeline for Implementation

Month	Innovation Element
September 2018	Parent & family resource guide Monthly family newsletter Monthly hosted family chat Mini student hosted family chat Updated parent & family website launch
October 2018	Monthly family newsletter Monthly hosted family chat Mini student hosted family chat
November 2018	Monthly family newsletter Monthly hosted family chat Mini student hosted family chat

I designed the four elements of the innovation to assist families in gaining the knowledge and skills needed to assist their student in the transition to ASU, as well as to help families feel supported and valued by the institution. As mentioned earlier, each element was directly linked to one or both research questions, as well as to one or both of the theoretical bases for the innovation. Table 7 lists each innovation element related to the theoretical base for the study.

Table 7

Innovation Elements Connection to Theoretical Base

Innovation Element	Funds of Knowledge Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez (1992)	Transition Theory Schlossberg (1981)
Parent & family resource guide		x
Family newsletter	x	x
Family videos	x	x
Family website revisions		x

As I planned the elements of the innovation, the funds of knowledge framework showed the value in giving family members the opportunity to learn and gain knowledge

not only from the institution, but to use the power of peer learning and knowledge transfer (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2014; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). In order to encourage family to family sharing of knowledge, each of the longer family videos included at least one current parent of an ASU student. This allowed the current parent to share real world practical advice to a new parent, coming from someone who currently lives the experience. A similar concept was used with the family newsletters. Throughout the semester, the family newsletter included stories of current family members called "ASU family spotlight." These stories highlighted their family journey at ASU and allowed the family to share tips with other family members from their own experience.

Schlossberg's (1981) transition theory was essential in the innovation design in providing an understanding of what students and family members may experience as they enter a major life transition. The core of Schlossberg's transition theory are the four S's: support, situation, self, and strategies (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995). I developed the elements of the innovation to address the four S's as much as possible. Much like the funds of knowledge framework listed above, NSFP aimed to provide support for family members moving into the transition through peer to peer sharing between family members. Additionally information provided through all four elements of the innovation showcased opportunities to become involved in order to assist family members in creating a broader support network, as well as to provide an opportunity to connect with their student.

The innovation also sought to help provide family members with opportunities to grow their strategy toolbox. Each element of the innovation provided information and connections to campus and family resources to aid in the transition process. The newsletter articles and videos incorporated topics on teaching strategies that family members could use in the transition process, both for themselves and in working with their student. The innovation also aimed to assist with Schlossberg's "S" related to the situation in order to help prepare family members for the transition to college (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995). Elements of the innovation provided information on what to expect and the timing of upcoming anticipated changes. For example, one family video provided information and support to family members on preparing themselves and their family as their student returned home for a break period. The self "S" in Schlossberg's transition theory is challenging for an innovation to aid in from the outside because it refers to personal characteristics and psychological resources a person uses during a time of transition. However, the innovation was meant to help families prepare and find support and resources throughout the transition to college.

Research Design

The research questions for this study were:

1. Do families of local students feel confident in their ability to assist their students in the transition to college during their first semester?
2. Do families of local students feel supported by ASU during their students first semester at college?

The study was a mixed methods design, where I collected both qualitative and quantitative data. According to Creswell (2015), by collecting and combining both types of data, a researcher is able to draw upon the strengths of both methods and understand issues and problems in more comprehensive manner. This study was specifically designed to be a convergent mixed methods study (Creswell, 2005; Creswell, 2015). Convergent design methods collect quantitative and qualitative data concurrently and then analyze the results separately. The researcher analyses both sets of results to determine how results from the quantitative and qualitative analysis compare.

Instruments and Data Sources

Quantitative data. I collected quantitative data through an online presurvey and postsurvey (see Appendix B for the presurvey and Appendix C for the postsurvey). The presurvey and postsurvey were not linked, meaning that the participants of the presurvey were not necessarily the same participants as the postsurvey. I chose not to link the presurvey and postsurvey because I was concerned with lower participation from families if two surveys were required.

The presurvey was completed by participants in September 2018, and the postsurvey was completed by participants in November 2018. The survey was an attitudinal measure related to the participants' feelings and perceptions (Creswell, 2005). The survey questions used a Likert-scale with a 4-point scale. The four response options were "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," "strongly disagree." At the end of the innovation, families received the same survey with slightly modified language to account for the completion of the innovation, as well as questions specially pertaining to the components of the innovation.

The survey contained questions related to four constructs: (a) family support, (b) connectedness to ASU, (c) campus resource knowledge, and (d) confidence in family transition support. The four construct areas related specifically to the research questions about family members' feelings and perceptions related to the support from ASU and their ability to support their student through the college transition process.

Additionally the postsurvey contained quantitative questions specifically related to the innovation elements. I asked about the four innovation elements including the family resource guide, family newsletter, family videos and the family website. The survey asked participants if they viewed or used each or any of the four elements of the innovation. If a participant had used or viewed an element, the survey asked them to complete four questions; one question related to each of the constructs. If a participant had not viewed or used that particular element, the survey sent them to the next question.

Qualitative data. I initially planned to collect qualitative data through the use of focus groups, with the goal of having 20 participants total. The first week after the initial email request was sent, I had no family members sign up for a focus group. A follow up email was sent the following week to try to garner participation. The second email provided only two family members willing to participate in a focus group.

Due to the low interest level in focus groups, and in consultation with my dissertation chair, I changed my methodology for collecting qualitative data to the use of individual interviews. I submitted a revision to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to amend the protocol. I included amendments for changing from focus groups to individual interviews and adding an incentive for participation, a $20 gift card. Once receiving IRB approval, a third email was sent to all potential participants with updated information that

included a request for an individual interview with the inclusion of a gift card for participation. The fourth, and final, email was sent to seek participation five days later. After the multiple email requests to recruit participants for focus groups, I was only able to find four family members willing to participate in individual interviews.

I conducted the four individual interviews using Zoom online video conferencing. Creswell (2005) stated that individual interviews are a good method to allow participants to voice their perspective, unconstrained from a researcher's perspective that could be found in quantitative research methods. Creswell further shared that interviews allow the researcher to ask questions and gain insight on useful information that the researcher did not directly observe. For this study, I obtained insight through individual interviews of four family members to learn about their perceptions and experiences of their family's transition.

I asked participants to take part in an individual interview at the conclusion of the innovation. I used Zoom to audio record interviews. Three of the interviews I completed were between 29 and 35 minutes in length. The fourth interview was only 15 minutes in length as the participant was very concise with answers. The purpose of the interviews was to gain a richer understanding of the feelings and perceptions of family members related to their family transition to ASU. I am limited in what claims can be made from the interviews given the small amount of participants and the brevity of the interviews. See Appendix E for the interview protocol and sample questions.

Timeline for Data Collection

Data collection began in the fall 2018 semester. As mentioned above, I sent a request to participate in the online survey to local family members who had student

beginning their first undergraduate year at ASU. I sent the request to participate presurvey in August of 2018.

Toward the conclusion of the fall semester, November 2018, local family members received an electronic postsurvey request. In late October, I sent a request to local families participate in an in-person focus group in November. After my methodology changed to the use of individual interviews instead of focus groups, I sent a request for participation in November 2018. I conducted in-person focus groups with families at the end of the semester in November 2018. Appendix F displays a chart with details related to the timeline of the innovation and study.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data. I selected the presurvey and postsurvey as a way to measure change and see differences that occurred over the course of the semester. I used paired samples t-tests to analyze the data for questions 1-19 in the presurvey and postsurvey (see Appendix B and C for the entire presurvey and postsurvey). The 19 questions related specifically to the survey constructs, not the innovation elements. The paired sample t-test analysis assisted me in determining if any statistically significant differences were present between the presurvey and postsurvey results (SPSS for Windows, 2012). I then interpreted the information and results. Statistical significance was found if a t-test had a p value of .05 or less. I also ran a second paired t-test to look at the difference in the presurvey scores compared to the postsurvey scores of those participants who utilized one or more innovation element(s). Again, statistical significance was found if a t-test had a p value of .05 or less.

The postsurvey contained additional questions specifically related to the four elements of the innovation. I compiled descriptive statistics to gain an understanding of how many participants completed each of the innovation elements, as well as the participant's perceived value of the innovation in relation to the four constructs. I used a one-way ANOVA test to analyze if any statistically significant differences were present between the number of elements of the innovation utilized and the participant's perceptions of the four construct areas (Laerd, 2017). I then interpreted the information and results. Statistical significance was found if a t-test had a p value of .05 or less. For all one-way ANOVA tests that had statistical significance, I conducted a post hoc Tukey test. I then interpreted the information and results. Statistical significance was found if a post hoc results had a p value of .05 or less.

I used the Mann-Whitney U test to look at the relationship between the four elements of the innovation and the four construct areas. The Mann-Whitney U test is a nonparametric test used to determine if there are differences between two groups on a continuous or ordinal dependent variable (Hart, 2001; Laerd Statistics, 2015). I chose this statistical test because while it is similar to an independent samples t-test, the Mann-Whitney U test was designed for use with ordinal variables, such as Likert scale questions. I completed the Mann-Whitney U test for each construct question, items 1-19, in comparison to viewing or using each element of the innovation, items 20, 25, 30, and 35. From there, I compared questions in each of the construct areas to each element of the innovation to see what, if any, differences may exist between the participants who viewed or used the elements versus those participants who did not use or view elements of the innovation.

Qualitative data. After I completed individual interviews, I transcribed each interview. I read and re-read the interview transcripts for familiarity. I used a two-step coding process. First, I used open coding. Open coding consists of reading each line of transcribed notes and listing any and all concepts, themes, or ideas that emerge (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Some examples from my open coding included ideas and concepts such as "likes getting communication from ASU," "already knows other families who have students at ASU," and "had confusion about how housing process worked."

The second phase of coding was focused coding. Focused coding involves line by line coding again, but this time the analysis was based on any topics from open coding that were of interest (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 1995). The themes that emerged from focused coding were (a) helpfulness of electronic communication, (b) friendliness, warmth, and feeling wanted, (c) challenge of transition, (d) benefit of being close, (e) pre-existing relationships, and (f) positivity in spite of challenge. Table 8 contains a list of overall themes, along with the codes that contributed to the theme.

Table 8

Codes and Themes from Qualitative Analysis of Interviews

Overall themes	Codes within theme
Helpfulness of electronic communication	Read emails Emails had helpful information Usefulness Provided information Communication from college Informative Frequent communication
Friendliness, warmth, and feeling wanted	Welcoming Encouraged Support Positive environment Very friendly Available support Excitement
Challenge of transition	End of an era Sorry for myself Letting go Giving up control Heavy
Benefit of being close	Frequent interaction Ability to see student Student comes home Easily assist student
Pre-existing relationships	Knew others from high school Friends had kids at ASU Coworkers had students Preexisting connections
Positivity in spite of challenge	Part of the process Process issues Expected challenges Assistance through issues Still excited about ASU

Data Validity and Reliability

Quantitative data. I used Cronbach's alpha test to measure the internal consistency of the questions within each construct for the presurvey and postsurvey.

After I administered and participants completed the presurvey and postsurvey, I used SPSS version 24 to conduct a Cronbach alpha analysis for each construct area, as well as for the overall survey. The Cronbach alpha is one of the most widely used tests to measure internal consistency for a test or survey instrument. Scores of reliability range from 0-1, with higher scores showing more reliability. Scores of .70 or higher are typically seen to be acceptable (Bonnett & Wright, 2015; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

The SPSS analysis of the survey provided fairly consistent scores between the four constructs, as well as for the entire survey for both the presurvey and postsurvey. The range of coefficient alpha estimates of reliability on the presurvey ranged from .863-.949, the highest score (.949) was for the overall survey. Table 9 includes a complete listing of Cronbach's alpha scores for the presurvey.

Table 9

Presurvey Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability (n=180)

Construct	Construct Items	Coefficient Alpha Estimate of Reliability
Family support	Items 1 - 5 (n=5)	.919
Confidence in transition	Items 6 – 9 (n=4)	.902
Connectedness to ASU	Items 10 – 13 (n=4)	.863
Campus resource knowledge	Items 14 - 19 (n=6)	.943
Overall	Items 1-19 (n=19)	.949

I found similar results for the postsurvey in Table 10. The range of coefficient alpha estimates of reliability on the postsurvey ranged from .880- .949, the highest score (.949) was for the overall survey.

Table 10

Postsurvey Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability (n=181)

Construct	Construct Items	Coefficient Alpha Estimate of Reliability
Family support	Items 1 - 5 (n=5)	.917
Confidence in transition	Items 6 – 9 (n=4)	.886
Connectedness to ASU	Items 10 – 13 (n=4)	.880
Campus resource knowledge	Items 14 - 19 (n=6)	.923
Overall	Items 1-19 (n=19)	.944

Qualitative data. According to Creswell (2015), "qualitative validity means that the researcher checks for the accuracy of the findings by employing certain procedures, while qualitative reliability indicates that the researcher's approach is consistent across different researchers and different projects" (p. 201). In order to address qualitative validity and reliability in this study, I employed member checks. According to Merriam (2009), member checking involves gathering feedback from participants in the study as a way of avoiding misinterpreting what was said. This process also helps the researcher to identify any misunderstanding that occurred, or potentially identify a researcher bias. After the completion of transcribing individual interviews and initial analysis, I asked participants to validate that I accurately captured the information they shared. Each participant validated that the information collected was an accurate reflection of their statements.

Another method to ensure the validity and reliability of qualitative data is to triangulate data (Merriam, 2009). One form triangulation is to use multiple forms of data collected to confirm emerging findings. After data was collected in this study, I used triangulation to corroborate evidence from both qualitative and quantitative sources of data to validate the shared experiences of local families' at ASU. The final method

utilized to ensure validity and reliability of qualitative data in this study was peer review. According to Merriam (2009) peer review is typically having a colleague or peer review material or manuscript and provide feedback or recommendations. Throughout the process of conducting the study and writing, both peers and dissertation committee members reviewed and provided feedback.

Chapter 4

Results

In Chapter 4, I outline the results from both the quantitative and qualitative data collected through this action research study. I collected quantitative data through the use of a presurvey and postsurvey and collected qualitative data through individual interviews. The research questions used to guide this study are listed below;

1. Do families of local students feel confident in their ability to assist their students in the transition to college during their first semester?
2. Do family members of local students feel supported by ASU during their students first semester at college?

I share overall quantitative results and analysis first. I present additional quantitative data by the four constructs used for the survey. The construct areas were (a) family support, (b) connectedness to ASU, (c) campus resource knowledge, and (d) confidence in family transition support. The four construct areas related specifically to the research questions about a family member's feelings and perceptions related to the support from ASU and their ability to support their student through the college transition process. Last, I discuss the qualitative results by themes that emerged.

Quantitative Results

Table 12 contains information from the post innovation survey, indicating which elements of the innovation participants took part in. The newsletter and resource guides were the most highly viewed elements of the innovation, with 119 (68.0%) of participants viewing the resource guide and 120 (68.6%) of participants viewing at least one newsletter. Less than half of the participants utilized the other two elements of the

innovation; only 69 (40.4%) of participants viewed the website and 35 (20.3%) of participants viewed a family video.

Table 11

Participation in Innovation Elements

Innovation Element	N	%
Viewed resource guide		
Yes	119	68.0%
No	56	32.0%
Viewed family newsletter		
Yes	120	68.6%
No	55	31.4%
Viewed family video series		
Yes	35	20.3%
No	137	79.7%
Visited family resources website		
Yes	69	40.4%
No	102	59.6%

Table 13 breaks down how many individual elements of the innovation participants utilized.

Table 12

Quantity of Innovation Elements Used by Participants

Number of elements used	Count of Participants	%
0	18	10.4%
1	45	26.0%
2	50	28.9%
3	42	24.3%
4	18	10.4%

Most of the postsurvey participants, 89.6%, indicated that they used at least one element of the innovation over the course of the semester. The most commonly used number of

innovation elements was two. Only 18 participants in the postsurvey did not utilize any of the elements of the innovation.

Table 14 includes the results of the value of each individual elements of the innovation. The survey asked participants to answer four questions related to each innovation elements they utilized. Each of the four questions related directly to the constructs guiding the survey; resource knowledge, connectedness to ASU, transition support, and feeling supported as a family member.

Table 13

Value of Innovation Elements

	Resource Guide		Family Newsletter		Family Videos		ASU Family Website	
Survey Question	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Provided me/my family valuable resource information								
Strongly agree	26	22.0%	19	16.2%	11	32.4%	22	33.3%
Agree	80	67.8%	86	73.5%	20	58.8%	42	63.6%
Disagree	10	8.5%	10	8.5%	3	8.8%	1	1.5%
Strongly disagree	2	1.7%	2	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
Helped me/my family feel connected to ASU								
Strongly agree	25	21.2%	25	21.4%	10	29.4%	17	25.8%
Agree	76	64.4%	72	61.5%	21	61.8%	43	65.2%
Disagree	14	11.9%	17	14.5%	3	8.8%	5	7.6%
Strongly disagree	3	2.5%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
Helped me/my family navigate the transition to ASU								
Strongly agree	23	19.5%	21	17.9%	9	26.5%	16	24.2%
Agree	74	62.7%	69	59.0%	22	64.7%	41	86.4%
Disagree	18	15.3%	24	20.5%	3	8.8%	7	10.6%
Strongly disagree	3	2.5%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.5%
Provided me/my family support as a family member								
Strongly agree	25	21.2%	22	18.8%	9	26.5%	16	24.2%
Agree	70	59.3%	68	58.1%	19	55.9%	41	86.4%
Disagree	20	16.9%	24	20.5%	6	17.6%	7	10.6%
Strongly disagree	3	2.5%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.5%

For all elements of the innovation, most participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the specific element being evaluated provided valuable resource information, helped families to feel connected, assisted in the transition to ASU, as well as helped them to feel supported as a family member. For all four elements of the innovation, participants rated highest that the innovation elements provided valuable resource information. The percentages ranged from 89.7% up to 96.1% of participants either agreeing or strongly agree that the element provided valuable resource information. For all four elements of the innovation, participants gave the lowest scores for the construct of providing support as a family member. The percentages ranged from 76.9% to 87.4% of participants either agreeing or strongly agreeing that the element provided support as a family member.

Construct 1 (family support). To understand the data related to the first construct, family support, I review the outlined tests and results below. First, I present a frequency chart showing the presurvey and postsurvey results for the construct questions. This is followed by two paired samples t-tests. The first paired samples test compares the presurvey and postsurvey results and the second paired samples test examines the presurvey results and postsurvey results for participants who utilized at least one element of the innovation. Next, a one-way ANOVA test looks at number of innovation elements utilized in comparison to construct question results. Finally, a Mann-Whitney U test explores participation in each individual innovation element and the construct question results.

Both the presurvey and postsurvey had five Likert scale questions created to gather information related to the participants perception of support that ASU is providing

them as a family member of an undergraduate first year student. Table 15 includes a comparison of results for the five family support construct questions from the presurvey and postsurvey.

Table 14

Comparison of Confidence in Family Support Questions between Surveys

	Presurvey		Postsurvey	
Question	N	%	N	%
As a family member, I feel comfortable contacting an ASU staff member if I have a question or concern.				
Strongly agree	77	43.3%	61	33.5%
Agree	73	41.0%	90	49.5%
Disagree	25	14.0%	24	13.2%
Strongly disagree	3	1.7%	7	3.8%
ASU is doing a good job of informing me of the services available to family members.				
Strongly agree	55	30.9%	50	27.5%
Agree	86	48.3%	104	57.1%
Disagree	30	16.9%	21	11.5%
Strongly disagree	7	3.9%	7	3.8%
I am satisfied with the resources available to me as an ASU family member.				
Strongly agree	62	34.8%	47	26.0%
Agree	82	46.1%	103	56.9%
Disagree	29	16.3%	25	13.8%
Strongly disagree	5	2.8%	6	3.3%
ASU is encouraging me to be involved as a family member during the transition to college.				
Strongly agree	71	40.1%	69	37.9%
Agree	69	39.0%	81	44.5%
Disagree	32	18.1%	25	13.7%
Strongly disagree	5	2.8%	7	3.8%
I understand how I can be involved at ASU to support my student.				
Strongly agree	56	31.5%	51	28%
Agree	59	33.1%	83	45.6%
Disagree	54	30.3%	38	20.9%
Strongly disagree	9	5.1%	10	5.5%

Using the results of the family support questions from the presurvey and postsurvey, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 16 outlines the results of the test. For all five questions in this construct, no p values were .05 or below, indicating that no statistically significant results were found.

Table 15

Paired Samples Test for Family Support Questions between Surveys

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q1	-.117	1.039	.079	-.274	.040	-1.471	170	.143
Q2	.012	1.068	.082	-.150	.173	.143	170	.886
Q3	-.071	1.047	.080	-.229	.088	-.879	169	.380
Q4	.024	1.130	.087	-.148	.195	.271	169	.786
Q5	.070	1.176	.090	-.107	.248	.780	170	.436

Using the results of the family support questions from presurvey participants and participants from the postsurvey who used at least one element of innovation, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 17 outlines the results of the test. For all five questions in this construct, no p values were .05 or below, indicating that no statistically significant results were found.

Table 16

Paired Samples Test: Family Support Questions between presurvey and participants who used Innovation Elements in Postsurvey

	Paired differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q1	-.052	0.966	.078	-.205	.102	-.665	154	.507
Q2	.052	1.086	.087	-.121	.224	.592	154	.555
Q3	-.026	1.038	.083	-.190	.139	-.310	154	.757
Q4	.078	1.135	.091	-.103	.259	.852	153	.396
Q5	.129	1.262	.101	-.071	.329	1.273	154	.205

The next statistical test I used was a one-way ANOVA test. I used this test to look at the impact of the innovation elements on the postsurvey questions within the family support construct, items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. This test looked at the average means for participants based upon how many elements of the innovation they utilized. The range was from participating in zero elements, up to all four elements of the innovation. Table 18 includes the results from the five construct questions related to the four elements of the innovation based upon participant utilization.

Table 17

One-Way ANOVA: Family Support and Innovation Element Participation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1	Between groups	6.060	4	1.515	2.548	.041*
	Within groups	99.883	168	.595		
	Total	105.942	172			
Q2	Between groups	6.605	4	1.651	3.185	.015*
	Within groups	87.095	168	.518		
	Total	93.699	172			
Q3	Between groups	7.092	4	1.773	3.511	.009*
	Within groups	84.327	167	.505		
	Total	91.419	171			
Q4	Between groups	9.084	4	2.271	3.727	.006*
	Within groups	102.361	168	.609		
	Total	111.445	172			
Q5	Between groups	16.870	4	4.218	6.685	.000*
	Within groups	105.985	168	.631		
	Total	122.855	172			

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed the one-way ANOVA test for all five construct items. For each of the construct items, I found a statistically significant difference based upon participant utilization of the innovation elements. For each item above, the more innovation elements that a participant utilized, the smaller the average mean, signifying more satisfaction with the family support provided by ASU. Participants who did not utilize any of the innovation elements had the highest average mean, indicating lower reported satisfaction with family support provided by ASU.

I completed a post hoc analysis since the one-way ANOVA showed statically significant differences when looking at the campus resource knowledge construct items and utilization of innovation elements. A post hoc Tukey test showed that statically significant differences existed, at $p < .05$, for all five of family support construct items.

Results were different for each specific construct item. Item 1 found statistically significant differences when comparing participants who had utilized zero element of the innovation against participants who had utilized two, p=.047, or four, p=.043, elements of the innovation. Item 2 found statistically significant differences when comparing participants who had utilized zero element of the innovation against participants who had utilized four, p=.047, elements of the innovation. Item 3 found statistically significant differences when comparing participants who had utilized zero element of the innovation against participants who had utilized two, p=.008, or four, p=.037, elements of the innovation.

Item 4 found statistically significant differences between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with participants who utilized two, p=.007, three, p=.039, or four, p=.014, elements of the innovation. Finally, item 5 found multiple statistically significant differences. First, differences were found between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with participants who utilized two, p=.029, elements of the innovation.

Looking at data from the postsurvey, I performed a Mann-Whitney U test to examine what, if any statistically significant differences could be found when comparing each element of the innovation with the questions related specifically to the family support construct. Table 22 contains columns for each element of the innovation and each row is a question related to the family support construct, items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the postsurvey.

Table 18

Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Family Support Questions

		M	SD	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp Sig. (2-tailed)
Resource Guide	Q1	1.87	.780	3241.50	.476
	Q2	1.92	.735	2819.00	.027*
	Q3	1.94	.728	2924.50	.099
	Q4	1.84	.804	2683.50	.009*
	Q5	2.04	.843	2464.00	.001*
Newsletter	Q1	1.87	.780	2996.00	.287
	Q2	1.92	.735	2831.00	.092
	Q3	1.94	.728	2936.00	.269
	Q4	1.84	.804	2753.50	.058
	Q5	2.04	.843	2779.50	.074
Videos	Q1	1.87	.780	2171.00	.347
	Q2	1.92	.735	1966.00	.066
	Q3	1.94	.728	1948.00	.064
	Q4	1.84	.804	1890.50	.036*
	Q5	2.04	.843	1805.50	.016*
Website	Q1	1.87	.780	3152.00	.207
	Q2	1.92	.735	5621.00	.270
	Q3	1.94	.728	5678.00	.431
	Q4	1.84	.804	5585.00	.233
	Q5	2.04	.843	5544.00	.189

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed the Mann-Whitney U test comparing the five items to the four innovation elements, for a total of 20 tests. Of the 20 tests completed, 15 of the tests contained no statistically significant differences, meaning that when comparing participants who viewed or used elements of the innovation against those who did not participate in the innovation element, I found no differences in the participant's perception of family support. Both the family website and family newsletter elements showed no impact on a participant's perception of family support.

Three of the questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed the family resources guide compared with participants who did

not view the guide. The three items were 2, 4 and 5. Item 2 was "ASU is doing a good job of informing me of the services available to family members." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .027. Item 4 was "ASU is encouraging me to be involved as a family member during the transition to college" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .009. The final item related to the resource guide was item 5, "I understand how I can be involved at ASU to support my student." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .001.

Additionally two of the questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed at least one of the family videos compared with participants who did not view any of the family videos. The two items were 4 and 5. Item 4 was "ASU is encouraging me to be involved as a family member during the transition to college" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .036. The next item related to the family videos was item 5, "I understand how I can be involved at ASU to support my student." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .016.

Construct 2 (confidence in family transition support). Similar to the previous construct, in order to understand the data related to the construct of confidence in family transition support, I review multiple statistical tests and tables. First, I share a frequency chart to show the pre and postsurvey results. Additionally, I review results from the following statistical tests; two paired samples t-tests, a one-way ANOVA, and multiple Mann-Whitney U tests.

Both the presurvey and postsurvey asked four Likert scale questions to gather data related to the participants perception of their confidence to support student in the

transition to ASU as an undergraduate first year student. Table 20 contains a comparison of results for the four family support construct questions.

Table 19

Comparison of Confidence in Family Transition Support Questions between Surveys

	Presurvey		Postsurvey	
Question	N	%	N	%
I feel confident in my ability to support my student when they are stressed.				
Strongly agree	92	52.3%	80	44.4%
Agree	71	40.3%	82	45.6%
Disagree	10	5.7%	17	9.4%
Strongly disagree	3	1.7%	1	0.6%
I feel confident in my ability to support my student through academic challenges.				
Strongly agree	79	45.1%	59	32.8%
Agree	74	42.3%	97	53.9%
Disagree	20	11.4%	21	11.7%
Strongly disagree	2	1.1%	3	1.7%
I feel confident in my ability to support my students' physical health and wellness.				
Strongly agree	104	59.4%	88	48.9%
Agree	59	33.7%	78	43.3%
Disagree	10	5.7%	12	6.7%
Strongly disagree	2	1.1%	2	1.1%
I feel confident to support my student through their college experience.				
Strongly agree	97	55.7%	75	41.7%
Agree	68	39.1%	91	50.6%
Disagree	8	4.6%	12	6.7%
Strongly disagree	1	0.6%	2	1.1%

Using the results of the confidence in family transition support questions from the pre and postsurvey, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 21 outlines the results of the test. In three of the four questions in this construct, the p values were greater than .05, indicating that no statistically significant results were found. For the fourth question, "I feel confident to

support my student through their college experience," the p value was .01. This value indicates a statistically significant difference between participants in the presurvey and postsurvey. The presurvey results show more confidence in a family member's ability to support their student through the transition to college.

Table 20

Paired Samples Test: Confidence in Transition Support Questions between Surveys

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q6	-.089	.854	.066	-.219	.041	-1.356	167	.177
Q7	-.126	.952	.074	-.271	.020	-1.707	166	.090
Q8	-.126	.879	.068	-.260	.009	-1.848	166	.066
Q9	-.163	.819	.064	-.288	-.037	-2.560	165	.011*

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

Using the results of the confidence in family transition support questions from presurvey participants and participants from the postsurvey who used at least one element of innovation, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 22 outlines the results of the test. In three of the four questions in this construct, the p values were greater than .05, indicating that no statistically significant results were found. However, item 7 showed a statistically significant result. Item 7 was "I feel confident in my ability to support my student through academic challenges." The p value for this paired t-test was .000. This value indicates a statistically significant difference between participants in the presurvey and

postsurvey. Again in this case, the presurvey scores show more confidence in a family member's ability to support their student's transition to college.

Table 21

Paired Samples Test: Confidence in Transition Support Questions between presurvey participants and participants who used Innovation Elements in Postsurvey

	Paired differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Q6	-.058	.931	.075	-.205	.090	-0.774	155	.440
Q7	-.394	.879	.071	-.533	-.254	-5.574	154	.000*
Q8	-.110	.984	.079	-.266	.046	-1.388	154	.167
Q9	-.142	.929	.075	-.289	-.005	-1.902	155	.059

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

The next statistical test I used was a one-way ANOVA test. I used this test to look at the impact of the innovation elements on the postsurvey questions within the confidence in transition support construct, items 6, 7, 8, and 9. This test looked at the average means for participants based upon how many elements of the innovation they utilized. The range was from participating in zero elements, up to all four elements of the innovation. Table 23 contains the results from the four construct questions related to the four elements of the innovation based upon participant utilization.

Table 22

One-Way ANOVA: Confidence in Transition Support and Innovation Participation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q6	Between groups	5.017	4	1.254	2.978	.021*
	Within groups	70.763	168	.421		
	Total	75.780	172			
Q7	Between groups	7.953	4	1.998	4.506	.002*
	Within groups	74.128	168	.441		
	Total	82.081	172			
Q8	Between groups	4.601	4	1.150	2.727	.031*
	Within groups	70.878	167	.422		
	Total	75.480	171			
Q9	Between groups	4.169	4	1.042	2.500	.044*
	Within groups	70.050	168	.417		
	Total	74.220	172			

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed a one-way ANOVA test for all four construct items. For each of the construct items, I found a statistically significant difference based upon participant utilization of the innovation elements. For each item above, the more innovation elements that a participant utilized the smaller the average mean, signifying more confidence in their ability to assist their student successfully in transitioning to ASU. Participants who did not utilize any of the innovation elements had the highest average mean, indicating lower reported confidence in their ability to assist their student successfully in transitioning to ASU.

I completed a post hoc analysis since the one-way ANOVA showed statically significant differences when looking at the construct items and utilization of innovation elements. The post hoc Tukey test showed no statistically significant differences, at p >.05, for items 6 and 9. For item 7, the post hoc Tukey test showed statically significant differences existed only between participants who had utilized one element of the

innovation compared to participants who had utilized either three, p =.004, of four, p=.026, elements of the innovation. For item 8, the post hoc Tukey test showed statically significant differences existed only between participants who had utilized one element of the innovation compared to participants who had utilized either two, p =.034, of three, p=.044, elements of the innovation.

Looking at data from the postsurvey, I performed a Mann-Whitney U test to examine what, if any statistically significant differences could be found when comparing each element of the innovation with the questions related specifically to the confidence in transition support construct. Table 24 contains columns for each element of the innovation and each row is a question related to the family support construct, items 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the postsurvey.

Table 23

Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation and Confidence in Transition Support Questions

		M	SD	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp Sig. (2-tailed)
Resource Guide	Q6	1.66	.670	3030.00	.144
	Q7	1.82	.694	2909.50	.058
	Q8	1.60	.665	3299.00	.595
	Q9	1.67	.650	2875.00	.044*
Newsletter	Q6	1.66	.670	2898.00	.152
	Q7	1.82	.694	2991.00	.266
	Q8	1.60	.665	3287.00	.963
	Q9	1.67	.650	2963.00	.226
Videos	Q6	1.66	.670	1965.00	.067
	Q7	1.82	.694	2121.00	.237
	Q8	1.60	.665	2055.00	.144
	Q9	1.67	.650	2113.50	.227
Website	Q6	1.66	.670	2809.00	.013*
	Q7	1.82	.694	2718.00	.005*
	Q8	1.60	.665	3024.00	.080
	Q9	1.67	.650	2961.00	.050*

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed the Mann-Whitney U test comparing the four items to the four innovation elements, for a total of 16 tests. Of the 16 tests completed, 12 of the tests had no statistically significant differences, meaning that when comparing participants who viewed or used elements of the innovation against those who did not participate in the innovation element, I found no differences in the participant's perception of their confidence in their ability to support their student through the transition to college. Both the family newsletter and family video elements had no items that impacted a participant's perception of their confidence in their ability to support their student in the transition to college.

Three of the questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed the family website compared with participants who did not view

the website. The three items were 6, 7 and 9. Item 6 was "I feel confident in my ability to support my student when they are stressed." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .013. Item 7 was "I feel confident in my ability to support my student through academic challenges" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was 005. The final item related to the website was item 9, "I feel confident to support my student through their college experience." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .050. Additionally, the family newsletter also showed statistical significance for item 9, with a p value of .044.

Construct 3 (connectedness to ASU). Similar to the previous constructs, in order to understand the data related to the construct of connectedness to ASU, I present multiple statistical tests and tables. First, I share a frequency chart to show the pre and postsurvey results. Additionally, I present results from the following statistical tests; two paired samples t-tests, a one-way ANOVA, and multiple Mann-Whitney U tests.

The survey asked four Likert scale questions were asked in both the presurvey and postsurvey to gather data related to the participants perception of their connectedness to ASU as a family member of an undergraduate first year student. Table 25 contains a comparison of results for the four connectedness construct questions.

Table 24

Comparison of Connectedness to ASU Questions between Surveys

	Presurvey		Postsurvey	
Question	N	%	N	%
I feel valued as a family member and member of the Sun Devil Community.				
Strongly agree	50	28.7%	46	25.7%
Agree	85	48.9%	96	53.6%
Disagree	34	19.5%	30	16.8%
Strongly disagree	5	2.9%	7	3.9%
I feel proud that my student attends ASU.				
Strongly agree	109	62.6%	109	61.2%
Agree	60	34.5%	59	33.1%
Disagree	4	2.3%	6	3.4%
Strongly disagree	1	0.6%	4	2.2%
I feel comfortable sending my student to ASU.	109	62.6%	105	58.7%
Strongly agree	62	35.6%	66	36.9%
Agree	2	1.1%	5	2.8%
Disagree	1	0.6%	3	1.7%
Strongly disagree				
I feel excited that my student attends ASU.				
Strongly agree	114	65.9%	103	57.9%
Agree	54	31.2%	60	33.7%
Disagree	4	2.3%	12	6.7%
Strongly disagree	1	0.6%	3	1.7%

Using the results of the connectedness to ASU questions from the presurvey and postsurvey, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 26 outlines the results of the test. In three of the four questions in this construct, the p values were above .05, indicating that no statistically significant results were found. For the fourth question, "I feel excited that my student attends ASU," the p value was .006. This value indicates a statistically significant difference between participants in the pre and postsurvey. The test results indicate that

the presurvey had higher average scores, meaning families in the presurvey were more excited to send their students to ASU when compared to participants in the postsurvey.

Table 25

Paired Samples Test: Connectedness to ASU between Surveys

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Q10	-.048	1.125	.088	-.221	.124	-.554	164	.581
Q11	-.091	.835	.065	-.220	.037	-1.403	163	.163
Q12	-.091	.787	.061	-.212	.030	-1.483	164	.140
Q13	-.190	.872	.068	-.325	-.055	-2.785	162	.006*

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

Using the results of the connectedness to ASU questions from presurvey participants and participants in the postsurvey who utilized at least one element of the innovation, I completed a paired samples test was competed to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 27 outlines the results of the test. In three of the four questions in this construct, the p values were greater than .05, indicating that no statistically significant results were found. For the item 4, "I feel excited that my student attends ASU", the p value was .015. Similar to Table 26, this value indicates a statistically significant difference between participants in the presurvey and postsurvey. The higher average mean indicates that presurvey participants reported feeling more excited to send their student to ASU when compared with postsurvey participants.

Table 26

Paired Samples Test: Connectedness to ASU Questions between Presurvey and Participants who Used Innovation Elements in Postsurvey

	Paired differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Q10	.000	1.032	.083	-.164	.164	.000	154	1.00
Q11	-.077	.894	.072	-.219	.064	-1.078	154	.283
Q12	-.103	.884	.071	-.243	.037	-1.454	154	.148
Q13	-.182	.918	.074	-.328	-.036	-2.458	153	.015*

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

The next statistical I test used was a one-way ANOVA test. I used this test to look at the impact of the innovation elements on the postsurvey questions within the connectedness to ASU construct, items 10, 11, 12, and 13. This test looked at the average means for participants based upon how many elements of the innovation they utilized. The range was from participating in zero elements, up to all four elements of the innovation. Table 28 includes the results from the four construct questions related to the four elements of the innovation based upon participant utilization.

Table 27

One-Way ANOVA: Connectedness to ASU and Innovation Participation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q10	Between groups	6.420	4	1.605	2.884	.024*
	Within groups	93.488	168	.556		
	Total	99.908	172			
Q11	Between groups	.012	4	.003	.006	1.00
	Within groups	78.936	167	.473		
	Total	78.948	171			
Q12	Between groups	.291	4	.073	.172	.952
	Within groups	70.923	167	.422		
	Total	71.214	171			
Q13	Between groups	.073	4	.018	.036	.998
	Within groups	84.643	167	.507		
	Total	84.715	171			

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed a one-way ANOVA test for all four construct items. Three of the four items showed no statistical difference based upon how many elements of the innovation the participant utilized. The three items that showed no statistical significance were items 11, 12, and 13. Item 10 showed a statistically significant difference based upon participant utilization of the innovation elements. The more innovation elements that a participant utilized the smaller the average mean, signifying more perceived connectedness to ASU. Participants who did not utilize any of the innovation elements had the highest average mean, indicating a lower perceived connectedness to ASU. I completed a post hoc analysis for item 10 since the one-way ANOVA showed statically significant differences. The post hoc Tukey test showed no statistically significant differences, at $p > .05$.

Looking at data from the postsurvey, I performed a Mann-Whitney U test to examine what, if any statistically significant differences could be found when comparing each element of the innovation with the questions related specifically to the connectedness to ASU construct. Table 29 contains columns for each element of the innovation and each row is a question related to the family support construct, items 10, 11, 12, and 13 of the postsurvey.

Table 28

Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation Elements and Connectedness Questions

		M	SD	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp Sig. (2-tailed)
Resource Guide	Q10	1.99	.764	2536.00	.002*
	Q11	1.47	.674	3379.00	.963
	Q12	1.47	.639	3408.00	.877
	Q13	1.52	.699	3257.00	.628
Newsletter	Q10	1.99	.764	2991.50	.275
	Q11	1.47	.674	3115.50	.636
	Q12	1.47	.639	3202.50	.717
	Q13	1.52	.699	3081.00	.554
Videos	Q10	1.99	.764	2131.00	.264
	Q11	1.47	.674	2264.00	.602
	Q12	1.47	.639	2251.50	.519
	Q13	1.52	.699	2368.50	.960
Website	Q10	1.99	.764	2928.50	.041*
	Q11	1.47	.674	3324.00	.596
	Q12	1.47	.639	3448.00	.795
	Q13	1.52	.699	3368.50	.673

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed a Mann-Whitney U test comparing the four construct items to the four innovation elements, for a total of 16 tests. The connectedness construct had the fewest statistically significant findings when compared to the innovation elements. Of the 16 tests completed, 14 of the tests had no statistically significant differences, meaning that when comparing participants who viewed or used elements of the innovation against

those who did not participate in the innovation element, no differences were found in the participant's perception of their connectedness to ASU. Both the family newsletter and family video elements showed no items that impacted a participant's perception of their connectedness to ASU.

One question showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed the family website compared with participants who did not view the website. Item 10 was "I feel valued as a family member and member of the Sun Devil Community." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .041. Participants who viewed the resource guide also showed a statistical difference for item 10. The p value when looking at the resource guide and item ten was .002.

Construct 4 (campus resource knowledge). Similar to the previous constructs, in order to understand the data related to the construct of campus resource knowledge, I review multiple statistical tests and tables. First, I share a frequency chart to show the pre and postsurvey results. Additionally, I present results from the following statistical tests; two paired samples t-tests, a one-way ANOVA, and multiple Mann-Whitney U tests.

The survey asked six Likert scale questions in both the presurvey and postsurvey to gather data related to the participants perception of their knowledge of campus resources as a family member of an undergraduate first year student. Table 30 includes a comparison of results for the four connectedness construct questions.

Table 29

Comparison of Campus Resource Knowledge between Surveys

	Presurvey		Postsurvey	
Question	N	%	N	%
I have a good understanding of the academic support resources available to my student at ASU.				
Strongly agree	44	25.4%	36	20.5%
Agree	74	42.8%	95	54.0%
Disagree	45	26.0%	39	22.2%
Strongly disagree	10	5.8%	6	3.4%
I have a good understanding of the health and wellness resources available to my student at ASU.				
Strongly agree	51	29.7%	45	25.6%
Agree	67	39.0%	85	48.3%
Disagree	48	27.9%	40	22.7%
Strongly disagree	6	3.5%	6	3.4%
I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU.				
Strongly agree	49	28.5%	37	21.3%
Agree	73	42.4%	88	50.6%
Disagree	44	25.6%	42	24.1%
Strongly disagree	6	3.5%	7	4.0%
I know where to go if I need further information on a resource for my student at ASU.				
Strongly agree	44	25.6%	34	19.3%
Agree	69	40.1%	81	46.0%
Disagree	45	26.2%	51	29.0%
Strongly disagree	14	8.1%	10	5.7%
I am satisfied with information ASU has provided to me about campus resources available to my student.				
Strongly agree	46	26.7%	36	20.6%
Agree	73	42.4%	87	49.7%
Disagree	45	26.2%	44	25.1%
Strongly disagree	8	4.7%	8	4.6%
The information I am receiving from ASU is on topics relevant to me as a parent of a new college student.				
Strongly agree	46	26.7%	40	22.7%
Agree	77	44.8%	93	52.8%
Disagree	41	23.8%	38	21.6%
Strongly disagree	8	4.7%	5	2.8%

Using the results of the campus resource knowledge questions from the presurvey and postsurvey, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences that emerged. Table 31 outlines the results of the test. For all six questions in this construct, no p values were .05 or below, indicating that no statistically significant results were found.

Table 30

Paired Samples Test: Campus Resource Knowledge between Surveys

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Q14	.049	1.125	.088	-.125	.224	.559	161	.577
Q15	.006	1.143	.090	-.172	.184	.069	160	.945
Q16	-.069	1.050	.082	-.234	.095	-.831	158	.407
Q17	-.043	1.158	.091	-.224	.137	-.476	160	.635
Q18	-.069	1.105	.087	-.241	.104	-.787	159	.433
Q19	.012	1.135	.089	-.164	.189	.139	160	.890

Using the results of the campus resource knowledge questions from the presurvey and participants in the postsurvey who utilized at least one element of the innovation, I completed a paired samples test to identify if any statistically significant differences emerged. Table 32 outlines the results of the test. For all 6 questions in this construct, no p values were .05 or below, indicating that no statistically significant results were found.

Table 31

Paired Samples Test: Campus Resource Knowledge Questions between presurvey and participants who used Innovation Elements in Postsurvey

	Paired Differences							
				95% confidence interval of the difference				
	M	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q14	.090	1.193	.096	-.099	.278	.939	155	.349
Q15	.026	1.179	.095	-.161	.213	.273	154	.786
Q16	-.020	1.150	.093	-.203	.164	-.211	152	.833
Q17	.065	1.193	.096	-.125	.254	.673	154	.502
Q18	.013	1.194	.096	-.177	.203	.135	153	.893
Q19	.065	1.149	.092	-.118	.247	.699	154	.486

The next statistical test I used was a one-way ANOVA test. I used this test to look at the impact of the innovation elements on the postsurvey questions within campus resource knowledge construct, items 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. This test looked at the average means for participants based upon how many elements of the innovation they utilized. The range was from participating in zero elements, up to all four elements of the innovation. Table 33 contains the results from the six construct questions in relation to the four elements of the innovation based upon participant utilization.

Table 32

One-Way ANOVA: Campus Resource Knowledge and Innovation Participation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q14	Between groups	58.547	4	2.137	4.080	.004*
	Within groups	87.470	167	.524		
	Total	96.017	171			
Q15	Between groups	8.736	4	2.184	3.722	.006*
	Within groups	97.980	167	.587		
	Total	106.715	171			
Q16	Between groups	16.275	4	4.069	7.752	.000*
	Within groups	86.601	167	.525		
	Total	102.876	171			
Q17	Between groups	14.125	4	3.531	5.865	.000*
	Within groups	100.544	167	.602		
	Total	114.669	171			
Q18	Between groups	11.410	4	2.852	4.907	.001*
	Within groups	96.497	166	.581		
	Total	107.906	170			
Q19	Between groups	11.025	4	2.756	5.430	.000*
	Within groups	84.765	167	.508		
	Total	95.971	171			

I completed a one-way ANOVA test for all six construct items. For each of the construct items, a statistically significant difference was found based upon participant utilization of the innovation elements. For each item above, the more innovation elements that a participant utilized the smaller the average mean, signifying greater perceived campus resource knowledge. Participants who did not utilize any of the innovation elements had the highest average mean, indicating lower perceived campus resource knowledge.

I completed a post hoc analysis since the one-way ANOVA showed statically significant differences when looking at the campus resource knowledge construct items and utilization of innovation elements. A post hoc Tukey test showed that statically

significant differences existed, at $p < .05$, for five of the six campus resource knowledge items. Item 15 showed no statistically different results in the post hoc Tukey test. Results for the remaining five were different for each specific construct item. Item 14 statistically significant differences were found when comparing participants who had utilized one element of the innovation against participants who had utilized two, p=.000, three, p=.035, or four, p=.020, elements of the innovation. For item 16, multiple statistically significant differences were found. First, differences were found between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with participants who utilized two, p=.034, or four, p=.041, elements of the innovation. Statistically significant differences were also found when comparing participants who had utilized one element of the innovation against participants who had utilized two, p=.000, three, p=.001, or four, p=.002, elements of the innovation.

The final three items shared a similar trend, statistically significant differences existed when comparing participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation against participants who completed two, three, or four elements of the innovation. Item 17 found statistically significant differences between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with participants who utilized two, p=.001, three, p=.001, or four, p=.001, elements of the innovation. Item 18 found statistically significant differences between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with participants who utilized two, p=.006, three, p=.041, or four, p=.030, elements of the innovation. Finally, item 19 found statistically significant differences between participants who utilized zero elements of the innovation, when compared with

participants who utilized two, p=.003, three, p=.031, or four, p=.035, elements of the innovation.

Looking at data from the postsurvey, I completed a Mann-Whitney U test to examine what, if any statistically significant differences could be found when comparing each element of the innovation with the questions related specifically to the campus resource knowledge construct. Table 34 contains columns for each element of the innovation and each row is a question related to the family support construct, items 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 of the postsurvey.

Table 33

Mann-Whitney U Test: Innovation Elements and Campus Resource Knowledge Questions

		M	SD	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp Sig. (2-tailed)
Resource Guide	Q14	2.09	.747	2367.00	.000*
	Q15	2.04	.788	2496.00	.002*
	Q16	2.11	.779	2140.00	.000*
	Q17	2.21	.818	2329.50	.000*
	Q18	2.14	.790	2542.50	.006*
	Q19	2.05	.747	2260.00	.000*
Newsletter	Q14	2.09	.747	3160.50	.775
	Q15	2.04	.788	3160.00	.778
	Q16	2.11	.779	2937.00	.372
	Q17	2.21	.818	2897.00	.232
	Q18	2.14	.790	2883.50	.242
	Q19	2.05	.747	2967.00	.330
Videos	Q14	2.09	.747	2241.00	.556
	Q15	2.04	.788	2077.50	.211
	Q16	2.11	.779	1839.00	.032*
	Q17	2.21	.818	1850.50	.030*
	Q18	2.14	.790	1914.00	.061
	Q19	2.05	.747	2062.50	.181
Website	Q14	2.09	.747	2776.50	.013*
	Q15	2.04	.788	2898.00	.045*
	Q16	2.11	.779	2647.00	.008*
	Q17	2.21	.818	2771.00	.015*
	Q18	2.14	.790	2792.50	.023*
	Q19	2.05	.747	2785.50	.015*

* Indicates p value that is statistically significant

I completed Mann-Whitney U test to compare the six items to the four innovation elements, for a total of 24 tests. The campus resource knowledge construct had the most statistically significant findings when compared to the innovation elements. Fourteen (58%) of the possible 24 Mann-Whitney U tests showed significant findings. Of the 24 tests completed, only 10 of the tests had no statistically significant differences, meaning that when comparing participants who viewed or used elements of the innovation against those who did not participate in the innovation element, no differences were found in the

participant's perception of their campus resource knowledge. The family newsletter was the only element that showed no impact on a participant's perception of their campus resource knowledge.

All six of the of the construct questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed the family resources guide compared with participants who did not view the guide. Item 14 was "I have a good understanding of the academic support resources available to my student at ASU." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .000. Item 15 was "I have a good understanding of the health and wellness resources available to my student at ASU" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .002. Next, item 16, "I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU", had a p value of .000. Item 17, "I know where to go if I need further information on a resource for my student at ASU", had a p value of .000. Next, item 18, "I am satisfied with information ASU has provided to me about campus resources available to my student", had a p value of .006. The final construct item related to the resource guide was item 19, "The information I am receiving from ASU is on topics relevant to me as a parent of a new college student." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .000.

Two of the questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who viewed at least one of the family videos compared with participants who did not view any of the family videos. The two items were 16 and 17. Item 16 was "I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .032. The next item related to the family videos was item 17, "I know where to go if I need further

information on a resource for my student at ASU." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .030.

Again, all six of the construct questions showed statistically significant differences between participants who visited the family website compared with participants who did not visit the website. Item 14 was "I have a good understanding of the academic support resources available to my student at ASU." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .013. Item 15 was "I have a good understanding of the health and wellness resources available to my student at ASU" and the p value for the Mann-Whitney U test for this item was .045. Next, item 16, "I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU", had a p value of .008. Item 17, "I know where to go if I need further information on a resource for my student at ASU", had a p value of .015. Next, item 18, I am satisfied with information ASU has provided to me about campus resources available to my student, had a p value of .023. The final construct item related to the resource guide was item 19, "The information I am receiving from ASU is on topics relevant to me as a parent of a new college student." The p value for the Mann-Whitney U test was .015.

Qualitative Results and Analysis

I collected qualitative data for this study through individual interviews with four family members of local undergraduate first year students at ASU in the Fall of 2018. I refer to interview participants as A, B, C, and D. Due to the low participation in interviews, the results shared below may not be reflective of the greater family transition experience at ASU. Results and analysis of the interviews led to the development of six

key themes in the transition experience of the four family member who participated. I review the themes that emerged from the data below.

Helpfulness of electronic communications. One theme that quickly emerged from the four interviews conducted is that each of the participants liked and consumed electronic communications. Without my asking specific questions related to the elements of the innovation, each participant shared that they found receiving emails and newsletters from ASU beneficial. Participant B stated that "throughout the summer and as school got started at ASU, I got periodic emails from the school. I actually thought that the literature was very helpful."

Other participants found the electronic communications helpful not just for resource information, but as a way to feel connected and supported by ASU. Participant C stated that "the emails we continue to get include all kinds of opportunities to participate and other information. All the information from the University pumps you up!" During her interview she talked about enjoying learning about resources at ASU, but more that the communications helped her to feel important and valued as a member of the ASU community and encouraged to be involved. Another participant shared that the electronic communications encouraged her to be involved and participate in activities at ASU. The participant also shared that some of the communications were useful in learning about ways and opportunities to support her student. Participant C stated that

> I liked getting all the information. It helped to inform me about things like finals and how to support through that or Family Weekend is coming and how we could participate in those activities. I didn't know that kind of communication existed at ASU. Now that I am a parent, I see it from a different lens.

Additionally, each of the interview participants specifically mentioned that they enjoyed reading and found useful information in messages from their students' academic college, or messages that pertained to supporting their students' academic success. Participant A shared that "It was interesting to hear from the college, learn about what cool things were taking place. I liked knowing what students were doing research wise. Gave me hope that my daughter could do things like that at some point."

Friendliness and feeling wanted. The second theme that emerged from the four family members interviewed was a feeling of friendliness, and being wanted by the university. Each of the participants talked about feeling welcomed, but it was not referring to being physically present on campus, instead it was related to how their interactions with ASU had made them feel welcome and wanted. Participant A stated that

> I feel like could call up many different offices and they would help me. I feel like I could even call the President's office, not that I would. I just feel like it is just so warm at ASU and very friendly.

Participant C had a similar response and shared that "The friendly staff at ASU makes me feel very connected, very supported."

Some of the statements around feeling welcome and wanted as a family member were very connected to the first theme of helpfulness of electronic communications. Participant B stated that "ASU did a great job of marketing and communicating how I could be involved. The emails I received made me feel very informed, and also that I was wanted in the process as a family members."

Challenge of transition. The next theme that emerged during the interviews was a feeling from the four family members that their student going to college was the end of an era for them personally, or as a family, and the challenge of the transition. For three of the participants this was their first, and only, child going to college and for the fourth participant, it was their youngest child going to school. Each of these participants expressed a variety of feelings and emotions as their student began their college journey.

Three participants, who identified as the mother of the student, specifically referred to the initial transition as a challenge in some form as their student entered college. Participant C stated that "I just remember having that absence and the presence of him not being there being very heavy. I was very cognizant that it was just two adult people in the house now, no children. It was weird." Participant D shared "I think maybe I was just feeling sorry for myself, more the end of an era, than just the fact that I missed her."

Participant C also thought about the transition for her student. Early in the interview, the Participant shared that sharing meals was an extremely important part of their family culture. The participant stated:

> Before he left for college, we would have dinners together every night. It's like a ritual and we gather around and we break bread and we talk about our day. It's a big part of our family culture. And I think for him it has been a transition. In the beginning, when he first left, I was always asking him if he ate, concerned that he wasn't getting enough food. I would ask him if he wanted to come home, get a plate of food or something, you know.

The participant recognized that the transition was challenging for their family as important family rituals changed.

Two of the participants also spoke of the start of the transition, or feelings of transition, that occurred before their student started at ASU. For Participant A, the feelings of transition started for her in the summer. The participant stated "I remember having the realization that I was going to have to start allowing her to have more adult responsibilities. I wasn't excited about it." Participant A shared that it was this realization that really started her thinking about the start of college not just as a change for her daughter, but also for their family and personally.

Benefit of being close. Each of the four participants recognized the benefit of living in close proximity of their student at various points during the interview. The reasons and meaning were different for each family, but in all cases, the close proximity helped give family members the ability to support in a way that felt positive for them. During the interview Participant D shared that their student was introverted and while being very academically connected, also felt that she was not robustly involved at ASU outside the classroom. She stated:

> I like the fact that she could escape to our house, where she had space and could feel safe. Maybe it was a benefit to her, allowed her to relax and let down her hair and not stress so much.

Participant D did realize that perhaps being close contributed to her student's lack of involvement. Since her student could escape to their family home, she may have not made the same social connections or outlets that she might have been forced to if living

farther from home. Toward the end of the interview, Participant D circled back to this thought and stated:

> I feel like maybe she should be more of a social life, but maybe she has exactly the social life that she needs and wants. I could argue that potentially, but the fact that she could escape to our house where she could have space to roam and be herself. Maybe that has given her the opportunity to academically flourish in a way she might not have if she didn't have the ability to come home, to her safe space.

Along similar lines, Participant B shared that their student had some ongoing health issues and being in close proximity has been helpful, and reassuring, for their family. During the interview the participant shared that "She has had a couple of medical emergencies. It was nice that we could just drive up and get her."

All four of the participants had students who were living on-campus, not at home with their family. During the interviews, participants shared that another benefit of the close proximity was having the ability to physically see their student on a regular basis. For Participant B this benefit came in the form of being able to see their student perform on campus. The participant stated "It has been really nice being close. We have taken advantage of the short distance, we come to campus and see her perform. Families living far away probably don't get that same chance, at least on a regular basis." Participant A shared that while they did not come to campus often, they did enjoy getting to see their student and going to eat or shop when they had the opportunity. Both of those activities had been important shared time for them before their student left for college and it made them feel happy that it could continue.

Pre-exiting connections or relationships. Each of the participants spoke at various points during their interview about relationships or connections they, or their family, already had as a virtue of being local. Participant A shared that:

> Being local here in the valley obviously we were aware of others going to ASU. We had some friends that were also sending their kids to ASU, or others who already had kids at ASU. These are families we know socially, mostly through our kids high school. We would talk and things like "Hey how are things going for your kid? Do they like ASU? Or sometimes “did you know about this” or “how does this work”?

Participant A also shared that these preexisting friendships and connections provided support, and at times information. They felt they could ask questions to other friends and family who had been through the process, family to family. The participant stated that pre-existing connections “helped guide me along the way, shared info, most of it was just little things, put my normal parent anxiety at ease.”

None of the participants had met any other family or parent of an ASU student that they had not known previously. Participant C stated it most clearly that “I have relied on my existing relationships. I feel like I haven’t needed to go out and pursue meeting other new families.” Each of the participants made a similar statement during their interview.

Positivity in spite of a challenge. The final theme that emerged from the small group of participants was continued positivity about ASU, despite a challenge that they or their student had experienced. Three of the four participants spoke very clearly about at least one issue or process that was challenging as their student transitioned into ASU. All

of the issues or challenges were logistical in nature and the participant felt was due to a lack of knowledge about a specific process or procedure.

For Participant B, one of the challenges surrounded financial aid. Toward the start of the interview, she shared that:

> We didn't understand the whole financial aid process. I tried to tell everybody that being a second generation college student wasn't really a whole lot better than being a first generation college student because I only know my own experience. I was limited by my knowledge and I went to school like a hundred years ago when it was a whole lot cheaper.

The participant went on to explain the specific challenge that their family encountered. While it was a frustrating experience, the participant was positive and enthusiastic about ASU during her interview. Toward the end of the interview, the participant stated that "We are so happy with everything and just excited for her to be a part of ASU." The other two participants who articulated a challenge had issues that centered on housing and dining. Neither participant was negative about their experience. After Participant A shared a point of confusion around a housing process, she stated "It's normal, I think, to not 100% understand and know everything about a place works. I was happy for the help and response. I am glad my daughter is at a place like ASU that cares."

Qualitative data and Survey Constructs. After analyzing the interviews, connections between the identified themes and the construct areas created for the surveys were evident. Again, it is important to keep in mind that the number of interviews completed does not provide enough data to be reflective of the larger ASU family population. Table 35 displays each theme and connection to constructs.

Table 34

Qualitative Themes and Relation to Survey Constructs

Qualitative theme	Related Survey Construct
Helpfulness of electronic communication	Campus resource knowledge Connectedness to ASU
Friendliness and feeling wanted	Connectedness to ASU Family support
Challenge of transition	Confidence in transition support
Benefit of being close	Confidence in transition support
Pre-exiting connections or relationships	Connectedness to ASU Campus resource knowledge
Positivity in spite of a challenge	Campus resource knowledge Family support Connectedness to ASU

Each of the themes that emerged from the four interviews overlapped with at least one survey construct, and four of the themes overlapped with multiple survey constructs. While the wording of the survey questions was not directly used by interview participants, the concepts, themes, and feelings expressed by interview participants mirrored the concepts the survey sought to understand. The positive statements made by interview participants was also similar to the positive results found in the quantitative data.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand and enhance the family transition experience of local families. The time period of the study was their students' first semester. The results of the study indicated that families who participated in at least one element of the innovation reported more knowledge of campus resources, felt more supported by the institution, and were confident in their ability to assist their student in the transition to college. In this chapter, I explore the results and analysis of data collected, by examining both the quantitative and qualitative data and viewing it through the lens of the theoretical frameworks. It is important to keep in mind that qualitative data collected was minimal. While the qualitative data provided interesting information, it cannot be generalized to the larger ASU family experience. Additionally, in this chapter I share implications for practice, limitations of the study, implications for future research, reflection, and a final conclusion.

Summary

In order to explore the findings of this study, I organized the discussion below by the four construct areas, as well as overall findings. I developed four construct areas to answer the research questions. The construct areas are (a) family support, (b) confidence in family transition support, (c) connectedness to ASU, and (d) campus resource knowledge. The guiding research questions were:

1. Do families of local students feel confident in their ability to assist their students in the transition to college during their first semester?

2. Do family members of local students feel supported by ASU during their students first semester at college?

Table 36 outlines which construct areas are related to each research question. Two of the constructs, family support and campus resource knowledge, apply to both research questions. The remaining two constructs apply specifically to only one research question. Confidence in family transition support applies to research question one and connectedness to ASU applies to research question two.

Table 35

Relationship of Constructs to Research Questions

Construct	Research Question 1	Research Question 2
Family support	X	X
Confidence in family transition support	X	
Connectedness to ASU		X
Campus resource knowledge	X	X

Family support. The transition to college can be a very challenging time period for both students and their families (Friedlander, Reid, Shupak & Cribbie, 2007; Herndon & Hirt, 2004; Sy, Fong, Carter, Boehme, & Alpert, 2011; Vianden & Ruder, 2012; Wang & Casteneda-Sound, 2008). One of the goals of this study and innovation was to better understand if families felt supported by the institution, and if so, what lead to the feeling of support using the lens of Schlossberg's transition theory (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995).

Through the elements of the innovation, families were provided information, resources, and tools to help navigate the transition to ASU. The purpose in providing this

toolkit was to help families develop more robust strategic information to help as their students entered ASU and to encourage families to use ASU as resource. Looking at the quantitative results from the study, participants who utilized at least one element of the innovation reported a statistically significantly higher level of support from the institution. Those participants who utilized more elements of the innovation, showed a higher perception of family support than participants who utilized fewer elements of the innovation. By consuming the information provided by the institution, families perceived they gained knowledge and felt supported. The interview participants also reinforced that they felt supported by the institution. For the interview participants, the most vividly shared method of support came in the form of electronic communications. The four participants repeatedly commented on the consistency and valuable nature of the communications, stating that the communications provided ideas on how to support their student and helped them as a family member to learn about resources available.

Another element to consider when thinking about family support is the people or human support. According to Schlossberg, the support S, refers to the support an individual has available to them during a transition, such as family, peers, coworkers, and friends (Evans et al., 1998; Goodman et al., 2006; Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995). I did not investigate the "people" support in the quantitative surveys, however, the interviews provided interesting insight on where participants were seeking support and information. Interview participants shared a support network that the innovation did not investigate. This support network consisted of the participant's preexisting friends, families of their student's friends and classmates, and even coworkers who also had students at ASU. Each of the four participants shared

that through these preexisting connections they were provided insight about ASU. These relationships also provided personal support for them when needed. The information and support gained from this preexisting support network carried power and significance for participants as these are people already known and trusted by the participant. With few interviews conducted, this theme should be explored further in future research to see if it is still relevant and consistent with more participants.

The comfort and reliance on preexisting relationships for information and support also has a direct connection to the funds of knowledge framework (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2013; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). The funds of knowledge framework explains that knowledge extends beyond an individual's personal learning. The real power of the funds of knowledge theory lies in the shared knowledge that individuals and networks create in communities. As individuals accumulate personal knowledge, they share this knowledge within their family, but also with their greater community network (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2013; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). Family members interviewed clearly articulated that a strong source of support for them personally, and as a family, were other families who had been or who are currently also at ASU. The four interview participants asked questions they had and were finding support from this preexisting network. Much of the research discussed in Chapter 2 pertained specifically to Mexican American families. However, the participants in this study were predominantly White families, signifying that at least for these four family members, learning from shared communities happened across other cultural backgrounds as well.

Participants also clearly articulated that since they had a preexisting support network directly connected to ASU, they had made no new personal connections to other families during the transition. The innovation did include aspects of current family members sharing information with new families through electronic mediums in the newsletter and video series. However, it did not contain any elements that provided a space for participants to expand their support network, either in person or virtually.

Confidence in family transition support. Students often turn to their family for support through challenging situations (Coburn, 2006; Sax & Weintraub, 2014). Schlossberg's transition theory would corroborate that family members are often an essential piece of a student's support network. Having a strong support network can assist the student in managing a large life transition, such as going to college. The first research question in this study aimed to understand if family members felt confidence in their ability to assist their student in the transition to college.

There were two interesting findings to note from the presurvey and postsurvey results for this construct area. The first finding was that, when comparing the presurvey and postsurvey, participants in the presurvey were more confident in their ability to help their student through their college experience. A factor that may place a role in this finding is timing. Participants took the presurvey in the first weeks of the fall semester. The postsurvey was taken by participants during the final week of the fall semester, which was the week leading into final exams. A family member in early September might not know, or fully understand, what the transition through the first semester would be like for their student, or themselves. The end of the semester is a challenging time. Students may be under stress with final projects and/or preparing for exams. Family

members may see or hear their student frustrated or stressed and feel less confident in their ability to navigate college.

The second finding that was related to the presurvey and postsurvey results was similar to the one above. The paired samples t-test showed that families in the presurvey were more confident in their ability to support their students academically, compared to the postsurvey participants. Again, the timing of the survey may play a role. Their students would have been preparing for final exams as family participants were completing the postsurvey. Additionally, after going through the semester, families may have been more realistic in their confidence after having the real world experience.

Looking at other quantitative results from just the postsurvey, participants who utilized at least one element of the innovation reported a statistically significantly higher level of confidence in their ability to support their student in the transition to college. Additionally, the more elements of the innovation participants utilized, their reported confidence grew higher. None of the elements of the innovation directly spoke to increasing a family's confidence level. However, each of the innovation elements sought to increase a family knowledge of campus. Families who are more informed, are more prepared to assist their student with challenges in an environment in which they are not personally navigating. Connecting these results with transition theory, perhaps the knowledge, information, and support provided by the institution helped families to feel they had strategies to manage the transition. Additionally, as families learned about what to expect and upcoming transitions, the gained knowledge about what to expect so that they could anticipate a change, which is often handled better than unanticipated change (Schlossberg, 1981; Schlossberg et al.; 1989; Schlossberg et al., 1995).

The participants in the interviews also supported that they felt confident in the ability to support their student. Each of the four participants asserted that they felt able to assist with any challenge their student might encounter. For example, when Participant C was asked about her confidence in supporting her student through college she shared that:

> I remember college super challenging, so it is important to be more compassionate and understanding. Academically 15 credits is a lot, it's a heavy load to carry. I feel like at first I was able to support with a little more understanding. Emotionally I would show more compassion and was just more encouraging to him like "you can do it." Now, at this point I can offer some techniques on how to manage time and how to manage homework and things like that. I feel good in knowing I can assist him.

The other participants shared a similar sentiment, that they felt they knew their student well and knew how they could support them. None of the interview participants in this study had any hesitation or waivered on their confidence to support their students.

Connectedness to ASU. The next construct that this study examined to answer the research questions was a family's feeling of connectedness. There was one unexpected finding in the quantitative data. When comparing the presurvey results to the postsurvey results, the families in the postsurvey reported less excitement that their student was attending ASU. The results were statically significant when looking at family members who participated in the innovation as well. Again, timing could be a factor in this result. Families took the presurvey at the start of the semester, as their journey was just beginning and the excitement level was high. The postsurvey was

completed as the semester was coming to an end. The newness of the transition had worn off and their student was entering their first round of college level final exams.

I found another interesting finding from the quantitative data when looking at the postsurvey. The connectedness construct was the only construct in which participation in the elements of the innovation did not have any statistically significant impact. The average mean for item 10 of the postsurvey, "I feel valued as a family member and member of the Sun Devil Community," were exactly the same for participants in the presurvey and postsurvey, regardless if they participated in any element of the innovation. Given both of these results, the elements of the innovation did not seem to create any sort of connection to the institution.

Campus resource knowledge discussion. Campus resource knowledge is important to this study for two reasons that I discuss in this section. First, by providing families with a robust understanding of campus resources there is potential to create a larger safety net for students. For many students, the first people they will turn to for support and information are their families (Carney, 2008; Coburn 2006; Junco & Mastrodicsa, 2007 & Savage, 2008). If families have the knowledge of resources available on campus, such as tutoring, coaching, or health services, family members can provide information to their students to encourage the student to seek assistance. Additionally, family members are often be the first to notice if their student is not doing well or is struggling. If family members have knowledge of campus resources, they can again share with their student or contact the service themselves to advocate for their needs.

Looking at the quantitative data gathered in this survey, participants who utilized any of the elements in the innovation showed a statistically significant difference in campus resource knowledge. Again for this construct, participants who utilized more elements of the innovation, showed a higher perception of family support than participants who utilized fewer elements of the innovation. The quantitative results were also supported by the qualitative findings. Throughout interviews, participants shared that they learned about resources available to them and their student through many of the electronic communications, as well as the resource guide and videos. The participants felt very well informed and felt that they could reach out for any assistance they needed. By providing resource knowledge through various methods, family members gained valuable information that could provide them transitional support and possible tools that could be used during times of challenge through the transition to college.

Another interesting connection to consider is the potential of spreading campus resource knowledge through family and friends networks, utilizing the funds of knowledge framework. The interview participants, along with previous research studies (Cortez, Martinez, and Saenz, 2013; Kiyama & Rios-Aguilar, 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012), reinforced that family members are learning and gaining insight from other family members, not necessarily institutional staff. The more the institution can provide all families with knowledge of campus resources, the farther knowledge is likely to spread as families may share it with other families. Some family members may not utilize any information sent by the institution for a variety of reasons; however, if a family member, friend or coworker shares that

knowledge or resource with another family, it may carry more weight and be useful in assisting the family.

Overall findings. Looking at the quantitative data, the one-way ANOVA highlighted an important finding. Families who utilized or engaged in some way with the innovation elements were more satisfied with the institution and support provided, had better understanding of the resources, and felt more confident in supporting their student through the transition. The post hoc analysis provided further insight that in most of the construct areas, participants who utilized two, three, or four elements of the innovation showed statistically significant differences than those who utilized fewer or no elements of the innovation. Additionally, there was no single specific element of the innovation that provided results that were dramatically different than another element. Combining these concepts, it does not seem to matter how a family chooses to engage with the institution, but more the fact that they are engaging with the institution that made a difference.

When looking at the specific elements of the innovation, the most highly utilized elements were the family resource guide and the newsletter. Both of these elements of the innovation were sent directly to the participants, either by mail or by email. The participants did not have to seek out the information. In contrast, the family videos and family website were much less utilized; both were utilized by less than half of the participants. Both of these innovation elements had to be sought out. Participants had to take time to navigate to either the website or the videos, requiring an extra step in the process. Creating avenues for family support, knowledge or involvement, institutions need to be mindful of the ease in which families receive and access the information.

Implications for Practice

Findings from this study indicate several implications for practice. This section outlines the results of this study and potential implications for institutions and university staff. Below I discuss three implications for this study for university staff members: (a) the utilization of peer to peer family learning, (b) increasing direct communication to family members throughout the transition, and (c) finding multiple outlets and avenues for family members to connect with the institution.

While only a handful of interviews were conducted, participants in the interviews shared that they relied on their preexisting support networks. These support networks included other family members, friends, and coworkers who also had students at ASU. The participants also shared that they had made no new connections at ASU in the first semester. This insight could be important for university staff to consider in two ways. First, how can university staff, or the institution, leverage peer to peer support? Could the institution implement programs or structures to help incoming family members learn and find support from other families? For example, family-lead programming or messaging could be utilized to create more knowledge sharing between families and communities. Another challenge for university staff is to how help further develop a family's peer to peer support network. The preexisting connections that a family has are helpful. Could families additionally benefit from connecting and learning from new family members at the institution? Perhaps the new connections could be related to students' majors, their interests, or even creating connections based on shared challenges.

As mentioned above, participants were far more likely to utilize and engage with elements of the innovation that came directly to them via mail or email. University staff

should consider methods for family communication and support that are direct to families and require few steps. One idea for university staff to consider is to develop a list of key messages, information, resources, and supports. University staff could then form the developed list into a robust communication plan, which could be spread at key times through the year to keep family members actively engaged, but not overly saturated, with information.

Another overall finding mentioned was that the more elements of the innovation a participant utilized, the higher they rated three of the four construct areas. While email and mail are one avenue for engaging and informing family members, university staff should develop a variety of avenues aimed to involve families. In the current study only 10% of the participants did not utilize any of the elements of the innovation; however, 155 of the participants utilized at least one element, and 60 of the participants utilized three or more. Thus, it seems that family members want to engage frequently and in a multiple ways.

Based upon the study and information learned from participants, I have already found ways to improve upon my current practice. To assist families creating connections with each other, as well as the institution, ASU is now hosting "send off programs" for incoming local students and their families. The sendoff programs will be held at selected local high schools the month before students graduate. All admitted students and their families will be invited to participate. The send off programs will celebrate students' acceptance to ASU, but, equally important, will provide an opportunity for students and families to prepare for the transition, ask questions, and begin building connections with others. In addition to university staff, a handful of families of current ASU students who

also graduated from that specific high school will attend. These seasoned families can assist in answering questions and also begin to build a larger support community.

The family resource guide was one of the most utilized and viewed elements of the innovation. For future iterations, I will update and expand the family resource guide with additional information. The family resource guide will include information specific to their students' academic college. By creating 14 unique versions of the resource guide, families will be provided with information more relevant to their student's journey at ASU. The family resource guide provided during this study was heavily resource driven. Future iterations of the family resource guide will also include information aimed at helping families navigate the initial transition time to ASU.

Additionally, the family newsletter will take on a different form. Instead of receiving a long newsletter once a month, families will instead receive a year round communication flow, which will consist of two emails each month. Each email will contain less information than the current newsletter, but will include more time specific information. The emails will be a mix of information about student and family resources, transitional information and tips, spotlights of current families, and upcoming opportunities for families to engage with the institution. One of the goals of this change is to also have multiple versions of the communication flow. The communication flow will be broken down into three location specific groups; (a) Arizona families, (b) domestic out of state families, and (3) international families. This change will allow for customization of messaging to each group to provide more relevant content.

Limitations

While the findings of the study are beneficial, it is important to consider the limitations of this study. The first limitation is the representative number of participants in the study. As mentioned in Chapter 1, in the fall of 2018 there were 6,789 first year undergraduate students from Maricopa County. However, only 4,629 students listed an email address for their parent/guardian on their admissions application. This means that over 2,100 families were not contacted to be a part of this study. It is also important to consider that students do not necessarily give contact information for more than one family member. Even within the same family, family members may have very different thoughts, opinions, and experiences surrounding the transition of their student to college.

The request for participation went out to the 4,629 family members who were recorded on admissions applications. I received approximately 400 of the requests returned as having invalid email addresses, leaving a potential population of 4,229 people. The presurvey and postsurvey had 180 and 181 participants respectively, which only represented 4% of the possible sample. As mentioned in Chapter 3, participants in the presurvey and postsurvey were not linked. The family members who took the presurvey may have been different than the family members who took the postsurvey and each had unique experiences. Having different participants for each survey make it challenging to draw any conclusions when comparing the presurvey and postsurvey. If the presurvey and postsurvey participants been the same group, different results may have been found.

The larger, and more serious, limitation, in this study is the low number of participants in the qualitative data collection. After multiple requests for participation for both focus groups and interviews, only four family members responded to the request for

participation. The information shared by the four family members provided interesting insight into their specific family transition experience; however, the very small sample size does not provide enough information to be generalizable to the larger family population at ASU. Additionally, the information collected from the four family members may be skewed due to the likelihood that family members who participated in the study are potentially more actively involved with their students.

The second limitation to consider is the demographics of the participants of the study. As discussed in chapter 1, ASU has a diverse student population. In the fall of 2018, 53.1% of the first year undergraduate class identified as a member of an underrepresented population. The reported demographic characteristics of the presurvey and postsurvey participants, as well as the participants of the individual interviews are not consistent with the first year student population at ASU. Of the presurvey participants, only 27.3% of the participants identified with a race/ethnicity other than White. The postsurvey results were similar with 27.4% of the participants identified with a race/ethnicity other than White. For participants in individual interviews, a similar trend was found, 75% of the participants identified as White and only one person identified with another race/ethnicity. These numbers are inconsistent with the overall population. If the participant population had been more representative of the overall population, different results may have been found.

Additionally, of the incoming first year undergraduate class from Maricopa county, 28% identified as first generation students on their admissions application. Again, the reported demographic characteristics of the presurvey and postsurvey, as well as the participants of the individual interviews are not consistent with the first year

student population at ASU. For the presurvey and postsurvey, only 16.4% and 14.9% respectively of family members reported only having a high school diploma or GED. These numbers are inconsistent with the overall population. If the participant population had been more representative of the overall population, different results may have been found.

Recommendations for Future Research

At the conclusion of this study, there are multiple areas to consider for future and expanded research looking at the local family transition to college. I suggest three areas of research for future studies: (a) understanding the perception and desire for family involvement from the student perspective, and (b) increased understanding of diversity on the experience, also considering family size. I discuss each area of recommendations for future research below.

The next area of future research suggested is to better understand the student's perspective on family connection and involvement. During this study, participants (family members) reported feeling knowledgeable, involved, and connected to ASU. It would be important to explore if students have the same perception of their family members. Additional research could also examine how students want their family members to be involved, and how that might differ by population and demographics.

As identified in the limitations section, participants in this study were mostly White, college educated family members. Future iterations and studies need to have an expanded participant base to examine the needs, wants, and perceptions of a wider variety of family members. Another element that was not taken into consideration in this study was family size. It would be helpful to know if participants have other children and

if they have already been through the transition to college previously with an older child. Researchers could then investigate whether families who had previous children in college had different needs, wants, and perceptions compared to families who are sending their first, or only, child to college.

Reflection

As this study concludes, I realized how much I have gained from this process. First and foremost, I have enhanced my understanding of viewing and utilizing families as important partners in the college journey. While there are regulations and policies around sharing student specific information, including families in the process and college journey can have a great impact on family satisfaction, and hopefully in the long run, on student success.

Throughout this study I have also contemplated how university staff and institutions can better support families through the major transition they are personally experiencing in sending their child to college. Institutions have staff, departments, and research that are specifically aimed to assist student's transition to college. How could institutions leverage the information and resources to also help family members through their own transition process? It would be interesting to see what would happen to student success if the institution spent more time and resources on preparing and assisting families in their own transition process.

Finally, this study and the action research process have highlighted the need for professional development training for staff. Throughout the process, I talked to many university staff who were wary of involving families. They often referred to family members as "helicopter parents" or "snow plow parents." While I am sure overly

involved families are a part of every institution, I do not believe that this is the average family experience. As times and generations change, there needs to be more professional development and training available to help university staff learn about family involvement and how to leverage family connections in order to better support student success.

REFERENCES

About Maricopa County. In Maricopa County AZ. Retrieved February 13, 2017, from https://www.maricopa.gov/3598/About-Maricopa-County

ASU Facts. (n.d.). In Arizona State University. Retrieved October 7, 2018, from https://facts.asu.edu

Bonett, D., & Wright, T. (2015). Cronbach's alpha reliability: Interval estimation, hypothesis testing, and sample size planning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 3-15.

Carney-Hall, K. (2008). Understanding current trends in family involvement. *New Directions for Student Services*, *122*, 3-14.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Coburn, K.L. (2006). Organizing a ground crew for today's helicopter parents. *About Campus*, *11*(3), 9-16.

Cortez, L., Martinez, M., & Sáenz, V. (2014). "*Por los ojos de madres*": Latina mothers' understandings of college readiness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *27*(7), 877-900.

Crede, M., & Niehorster, S. (2012). Adjustment to college as measured by the student adaptation to college questionnaire: A quantitative review of its structure and relationships with correlates and consequences. *Educational Psychology Review*, *24*(1), 133-165.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I, & Shaw. L.L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Esteban-Guitart, M., & Moll, L. (2014). Funds of identity: A new concept based on the funds of knowledge approach. *Culture & Psychology*, *20*(1), 31-48.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., and Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998) *Student Development in College: Theory, Research, and Practice*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Friedlander, L., Reid, G., Shupak, N., & Cribbie, R. (2007). Social support, self-esteem, and stress as predictors of adjustment to university among first-year undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(3), 259-274.

Goodman, J., Schlossberg, N. K., & Anderson, M. L. (2006). *Counseling adults in transition* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.

González, N., Moll, A., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Griffin, K. A., & Gilbert, C. K. (2015). Better transitions for troops: An application of Schlossberg's transition framework to analyses of barriers and institutional support structures for student veterans. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*(1), 71-97.

Hart, A. (2001). Mann-Whitney test is not just a test of medians: Differences in spread can be important. *BMJ, 323*, 391-393.

Hedges, H., Cullen, J., & Jordan, B. (2011). Early years curriculum: Funds of knowledge as a conceptual framework for children's interests. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(2), 185-205.

Herndon, M., & Hirt, J. (2004). Black students and their families. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*(4), 489-513.

Junco, R., Mastrodicasa, J., & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2007). *Connecting to the net generation: What higher education professionals need to know about today's students.* Washington, DC: NASPA.

Katz, S., & Somers, C. (2017). Individual and environmental predictors of college adjustment: Prevention and intervention. *Current Psychology, 36*(1), 56-65.

Kiyama, J. (2010). College aspirations and limitations: The role of educational ideologies and funds of knowledge in Mexican American families. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(2), 330-356.

Kiyama, J., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Funds of knowledge in higher education: Honoring students' cultural experiences and resources as strengths*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Laerd Statistics (2015). Mann-Whitney U test using SPSS Statistics. Statistical tutorials and software guides. Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/

Laerd Statistics (2017). One-way ANOVA using SPSS Statistics. Statistical tutorials and software guides. Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/

Lopez, G. R. (2001). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an immigrant household. *Harvard Educational Review*, *71*(3), 416-37.

Lum, L. (2006). Handling "helicopter parents." *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, *23*(20), 40-43.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mcdevitt, S. (2016). Rediscovering and Reconnecting Funds of Knowledge of Immigrant Children, Families, and Teachers. *Childhood Education*, *92*(6), 470-475.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*, 132-141. doi:10.1080/00405849209543534

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *Experiences that matter: Enhancing student learning and success.* Retrieved September 20, 2017 from http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE%5F2007%5FAnnual%5FReport/docs/withhold/NSSE_2007_Annual_Report.pdf

New American University: Toward 2025 and beyond. (n.d.). In *Arizona State University*. Retrieved October 01, 2017 from https://president.asu.edu/about/asucharter

Rios-Aguilar, C., & Kiyama, J. (2012). Funds of knowledge: An approach to studying Latina(o) students' transition to college. *Journal of Latino/as and Education*, *11*(1), 2-16.

Rios-Aguilar, C., Kiyama, J., Gravitt, M., & Moll, L. (2011). Funds of knowledge for the poor and forms of capital for the rich? A capital approach to examining funds of knowledge. *School Field*, *9*(2), 163-184.

Rodriguez, G. M. (2013). Power and Agency in Education: Exploring the Pedagogical Dimensions of Funds of Knowledge. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 87-120.

Savage, M. (2007). *National survey of college and university parent programs*. Retrieved from http://parent.umn.edu/parentsurveys.html

Savage, M. & Petree, C. (2015). *National survey of college and university parent programs*. Retrieved from https://www.rit.edu/studentaffairs/parentsandfamilies/sites/rit.edu.studentaffairs.parentsandfamilies/files/directory/2015%20National%20Parent%20Program%20Survey.pdf

Sax, L.J. & Weintraub, D.S. (2014). Exploring the parental role in first year students' emotional well-being: Considerations by gender. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *51*(2), 113-127.

Schlossberg, N. K. (1981). A model for analyzing human adaption to transition. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *9*(2), 2-18.

Schlossberg, N. K., Lynch, A. Q., & Chickering, A.W. (1989). *Improving higher education environments for adults: Responsive programs and services from entry to departure*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlossberg, K., Waters, E., & Goodman, J. (1995). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking practice with theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

SPSS for Windows: Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. (2012). Austin, TX: Division of Statistics and Scientific Computing. Retrieved from https://stat.utexas.edu/images/SSC/Site/documents/SPSS_DescriptiveStats.pdf

Sy, S., Fong, K., Carter, R., Boehme, J., & Alpert, A. (2011). Parent support and stress among first-generation and continuing-generation female students during the transition to college. *Journal of College Student Retention*, *13*(3), 383-398.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 53-55. doi:10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Tovar E. & Simon M. A. (2006). Academic Probation as a Dangerous Opportunity: Factors Influencing Diverse College Students' Success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *30*(7), 547-564.

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). *Profile of undergraduate students: 2011–12 web tables*. Retrieved October 9, 2017, from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015167.pdf

Vianden, J, & Ruder, J. (2012). Our best friend is moving away: Exploring parent transition and involvement during their student's first year in college. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, *38*(2), 62-77.

Villenas, S., & Moreno, M. (2001). To "*valerse por si misma*" between race, capitalism, and patriarchy: Latina mother-daughter pedagogies in North Carolina. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(5), 671-687.

Virtue, D. (2006). Meeting the needs of immigrant and refugee children in Denmark. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 42*(3), 133-135.

Ward-Roof, J., Heaton, P., Coburn, M., & Carney-Hall, K. C. (2008). Capitalizing on parent and family partnerships through programming. *New Directions for Student Services, 122*, 43-55.

Wang, C., & Castañeda-Sound, C. (2008). The role of generational status, self-esteem, academic self-efficacy, and perceived social support in college students' psychological well-being. *Journal of College Counseling, 11*(2), 101-118.

Wartman, K. & Savage, M. (2008). Parental involvement in higher education: Understanding the relationship among students, parents, and the institution. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 33*(6), 1-125.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY PARTICIPANT REQUEST FORM

Dear participant,

My name is Sarah Brice and I am a doctoral student in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) at Arizona State University (ASU). I am working under the direction of Dr. Lauren Harris, a faculty member in MLFTC. We are conducting a research study on the transition from high school to college for families who have completed a program through the Access ASU office. The purpose of this study to better understand the experiences of families as their student and family adjust to life at ASU.

We are asking for your help, which will involve your participation in 2 surveys. Surveys can be taken online or on paper. I anticipate the surveys will take 15 minutes each to complete. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty whatsoever.

The benefit to participation is the opportunity for you to provide feedback about the transition experience and family support available at ASU. Responses collected will inform future iterations of the study and programming for families. Thus, there is potential to enhance the experiences of ASU students and families. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Your responses will be confidential. Results from this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used.

Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team, Dr. Lauren Harris at Lauren.Harris1@asu.edu, or Sarah Brice at sarah.brice@asu.edu or (480) 965-0299.

Thank you,

Sarah Brice, Doctoral Student
Lauren Harris, Associate Professor

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact Sarah Brice at 480-965-0299 or the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at 480-965-6788.

APPENDIX B

FAMILY TRANSITION AND EXPERINCE PRESURVEY

Family Transition Experience Presurvey

Family Support

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to family support at ASU. In the context of this study, family support is defined as ASU's support and services available to family members as an essential member of the Sun Devil family.

1. As a family member, I feel comfortable contacting an ASU staff member if I have a question or concern.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
2. ASU is doing a good job of informing me of the services available to family members.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
3. I am satisfied with the resources available to me as an ASU family member.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
4. ASU is encouraging me to be involved as a family member during the transition to college.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
5. I understand how I can be involved at ASU to support my student.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Confidence in Family Transition Support

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to your confidence in supporting your student in their transition to college. In the context of this study, confidence in transition support is defined as your ability to assist your student to adjusting to college their first year undergraduate students year.

6. I feel confident in my ability to support my student when they are stressed.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
7. I feel confident in my ability to support my student through academic challenges.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
8. I feel confident in my ability to support my students' physical health and wellness.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
9. I feel confident to support my student through their college experience.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Connectedness to ASU

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to the communications you received from ASU as your student prepared to start college. In the context of this study, connectedness to ASU is defined as you/your family's relationship with ASU.

10. I feel valued as a family member and member of the Sun Devil Community.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
11. I feel proud that my student will attend ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
12. I feel comfortable sending my student to ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
13. I feel excited that my student will attend ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Campus Resource Knowledge

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to your knowledge of campus resources available to your student. In the context of this study, campus resource knowledge is defined as your knowledge as a family member of services available at ASU for your student.

14. I have a good understanding of the academic support resources available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
15. I have a good understanding of the health and wellness resources available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
16. I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
17. I know where to go if I need further information on a resource for my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
18. I am satisfied with information ASU has provided to me about campus resources available to my student.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
19. The information I am receiving from ASU is on topics relevant to me as a parent of a new college student.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Demographic Information

20. **Please select your student's primary campus location (chose one):**
    - Downtown Phoenix Campus
    - Polytechnic Campus
    - Tempe Campus
    - West Campus

21. **Which Academic College is your students' major in?**
    - College of Health Solutions
    - College of Integrated Sciences & Arts
    - College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
    - College of Nursing and Health Innovation
    - College of Public Service & Community Solutions
    - Future of Innovation in Society
    - Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
    - Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering,
    - Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
    - New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
    - School of Sustainability
    - Thunderbird School of Global Management
    - Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication
    - W. P. Carey School of Business
    - Unsure

22. **Is your student enrolled at ASU as a full-time student or part-time student?**
    - Full-time (12 or more credit hours this semester)
    - Part-time (less than 12 credit hours this semester)

23. **Is your student planning to live on or off campus?**
    - On-campus (Residence hall/dorm)
    - Off campus, at home with family
    - Off campus, apartment/house not with immediate family

24. **What is your relationship to the student?**
    - Mother
    - Father
    - Grandparent
    - Legal guardian
    - Other

25. **What is your gender?**
    - Female
    - Male
    - Not listed above

26. **What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply)**
    - Hispanic or Latino/a
    - American Indian or Alaska Native
    - Asian
    - Black or African American
    - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    - White
    - Other

27. **What is your highest degree earned?**
    - High school diploma or GED
    - Associate Degree
    - Bachelor Degree
    - Master Degree
    - Doctorate Degree
    - Other

28. **What is the primary language spoken in your household?**
    - English
    - Spanish
    - Other

Thank You for participating in the family engagement survey!

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this survey, then please do not hesitate to contact me directly at sarah.brice@asu.edu or 480-965-0299.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at (480) 965-6788.

APPENDIX C

FAMILY TRANSITION AND EXPERINCE POSTSURVEY

Family Transition Experience Postsurvey

Family Support

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to family support at ASU. In the context of this study, family support is defined as ASU's support and services available to family members as an essential member of the Sun Devil family.

1. As a family member, I feel comfortable contacting an ASU staff member if I have a question or concern.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
2. ASU is doing a good job of informing me of the services available to family members.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
3. I am satisfied with the resources available to me as an ASU family member.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
4. ASU is encouraging me to be involved as a family member during the transition to college.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
5. I understand how I can be involved at ASU to support my student.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Confidence in Family Transition Support

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to your confidence in supporting your student in their transition to college. In the context of this study, confidence in transition support is defined as your ability to assist your student to adjusting to college their freshman year.

6. I feel confident in my ability to support my student when they are stressed.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
7. I feel confident in my ability to support my student through academic challenges.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
8. I feel confident in my ability to support my students' physical health and wellness.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
9. I feel confident to support my student through their college experience.			
Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Connectedness to ASU

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree

related to the communications you received from ASU as your student prepared to start college. In the context of this study, connectedness to ASU is defined as you/your family's relationship with ASU.

10. I feel valued as a family member and member of the Sun Devil Community.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. I feel proud that my student attends ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12. I feel comfortable sending my student to ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. I feel excited that my student attends ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Campus Resource Knowledge

For the following questions, please select an answer of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree related to your knowledge of campus resources available to your student. In the context of this study, campus resource knowledge is defined as your knowledge as a family member of services available at ASU for your student.

14. I have a good understanding of the academic support resources available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I have a good understanding of the health and wellness resources available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. I have a good understanding of the involvement opportunities available to my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17. I know where to go if I need further information on a resource for my student at ASU.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. I am satisfied with information ASU has provided to me about campus resources available to my student.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19. The information I am receiving from ASU is on topics relevant to me as a parent of a new college student.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Post Innovation Questions

Family Resource Guide

20. I have viewed the family resource guide that was mailed to families in early September 2018?

- Yes
- No

(If the answer to # 1 is yes, questions below will populate. If the answer is no, participants will move to the next section)

21. The family resource guide provided me/my family valuable resource information?

- Yes
- No

22. The family resource guide helped me /my family to feel connected to ASU?

- Yes
- No

23. The family resource guide helped me/my family to navigate the transition to ASU?

- Yes
- No

24. The family resource guide provided me/my family support as a family member?

- Yes
- No

Newsletter Questions

25. I have viewed or read the "Sun Devil Family News" newsletter?

- Yes
- No

(If the answer to # 1 is yes, questions below will populate. If the answer is no, participants will move to the next section)

26. The family newsletter provided me/my family valuable resource information?

- Yes
- No

27. The family newsletter helped me/my family to feel connected to ASU?

- Yes
- No

28. The family newsletter helped me/my family to navigate the transition to ASU?

- Yes
- No

29. The family newsletter provided me/my family support as a family member?

- Yes
- No

Family Chats

30. **I have viewed one or more family connections videos/chats?**
    - Yes
    - No

(If the answer to # 1 is yes, questions below will populate. If the answer is no, participants will move to the next section)

31. **The family connection video(s) provided me/my family valuable resource information?**
    - Yes
    - No

32. **The family connection video(s) helped me/my family to feel connected to ASU?**
    - Yes
    - No

33. **The family connection video(s) helped me/my family to navigate the transition to ASU?**
    - Yes
    - No

34. **The family connection video(s) provided me/my family support as a family member?**
    - Yes
    - No

Parent & Family Website

35. **I have visited the ASU Parent & Family Resources website?**
    - Yes
    - No

(If the answer to # 1 is yes, questions below will populate. If the answer is no, participants will move to the next section)

The ASU Parent & Family Resources website provided me/my family valuable resource information?
- Yes
- No

36. **The ASU Parent & Family Resources website helped me/my family to feel connected to ASU?**
    - Yes
    - No

37. **The ASU Parent & Family Resources website helped me/my family to navigate the transition to ASU?**
    - Yes
    - No

38. **The ASU Parent & Family Resources website provided me/my family support as a family member?**
- Yes
- No

Demographic Information

39. **Please select your student's primary campus location (chose one):**
    - Downtown Phoenix Campus
    - Polytechnic Campus
    - Tempe Campus
    - West Campus

40. **Which Academic College is your students' major in?**
    - College of Health Solutions
    - College of Integrated Sciences & Arts
    - College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
    - College of Nursing and Health Innovation
    - Future of Innovation in Society
    - Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
    - Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering,
    - Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
    - New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
    - School of Sustainability
    - Thunderbird School of Global Management
    - Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication
    - W. P. Carey School of Business
    - Watts College of Public Service & Community Solutions
    - Unsure

41. **Is your student enrolled at ASU as a full-time student or part-time student?**
    - Full-time (12 or more credit hours this semester)
    - Part-time (less than 12 credit hours this semester)

42. **Is your student planning to live on or off campus?**
    - On-campus (Residence hall/dorm)
    - Off campus, at home with family
    - Off campus, apartment/house not with immediate family

43. **What is your relationship to the student?**
    - Mother
    - Father
    - Grandparent
    - Legal guardian
    - Other

44. **What is your gender?**
    - Female
    - Male
    - Not listed above

45. **What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply)**
    - Hispanic or Latino/a
    - American Indian or Alaska Native
    - Asian
    - Black or African American
    - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    - White
    - Other

46. **What is your highest degree earned?**
    - High school diploma or GED
    - Associate Degree
    - Bachelor Degree
    - Master Degree
    - Doctorate Degree
    - Other

47. **What is the primary language spoken in your household?**
    - English
    - Spanish
    - Other

Thank You for participating in the family engagement survey!

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this survey, then please do not hesitate to contact me directly at sarah.brice@asu.edu or 480-965-0299.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at (480) 965-6788.

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT REQUEST FORM

My name is Sarah Brice and I am a doctoral student in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (MLFTC) at Arizona State University (ASU). I am working under the direction of Dr. Lauren Harris, a faculty member in MLFTC. We are conducting a research study on the transition from high school to college for families who live in Maricopa County. The purpose of this study to better understand the experiences of local families as their student and family adjust to life at ASU.

We are asking for your help, which will involve your participation an interview. I anticipate the interview will take no longer than 30 minutes to complete. I would like to audio record this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want to be recorded.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty whatsoever. Participants will receive a $10 Starbucks gift card for their participation in the interview. The benefit to participation is the opportunity for you to provide feedback about the transition experience and family support available at ASU. Responses collected will inform future iterations of the study and programming for families. Thus, there is potential to enhance the experiences of ASU students and families. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Your responses will be confidential. Results from this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used.

Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study and will let me audio record your responses by verbally indicating your consent.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team, Dr. Lauren Harris at Lauren.Harris1@asu.edu, or Sarah Brice at sarah.brice@asu.edu or (480) 965-0299.

Thank you,
Sarah Brice, Doctoral Student
Lauren Harris, Associate Professor

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact Sarah Brice at 480-965-0299 or the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at 480-965-6788.

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

[Read interview consent for zoom and obtain verbal consent]

[Begin audio recording. State name of participants and date.]

1. What, if anything, helped you be/feel informed about the transition process?
2. What information do you wish you would have known about the transition to college?
3. As a family member, have you been encouraged to be involved at ASU? If yes, how? If not, why?
4. What was the transition from high school to college like for you and your family?
5. What experiences or issues did you encounter that were unexpected?
6. Did you feel confident and prepared to support your student in their first semester of college? If yes, why? If not, why?
7. Have you connected with other families at ASU? If yes, how/when? If not, why?
8. Do you feel valued as a member of the ASU community? If yes, how? If not, why?
9. What ASU resources did you or your student use during their first semester?
10. How did you learn about resources available for you and your student at ASU?

Thank you for your time!

[End audio recording, with name of participant and date]

APPENDIX F

TIMELINE OF INNOVATION

Timeline of Innovation

Time frame	Action	Procedures
August 2018	1. Submitted IRB approval paperwork 2. Study participant enrollment & consent forms completed 3. Presurvey distributed 4. Creation of September newsletter 5. Finalized parent & family resource guide 6. Filmed September family video 7. Filmed September mini video 8. Finalized parent & family website update	Contacted potential families to participate in the program Worked with marketing and communications team to develop monthly newsletter Worked with marketing and communications team to develop parent and family resource guide Worked with marketing and creative services team to film family chat and mini family video Worked on parent and family website updates with relevant departments Distributed survey
September 2018	1. Sent September newsletter 2. September family videos published 3. Created October newsletter 4. Sent parent & family resource guide 5. Filmed October family video 6. Filmed October mini video 7. Parent & family website updates went live	Worked with marketing and communications team to develop monthly newsletter Worked with marketing and creative services team to film family chat and mini family video

Timeline of Innovation (cont)

October 2018	1. Sent October newsletter 2. October family videos published 3. Created November newsletter 4. Filmed November family video 5. Filmed November mini video 6. Finalized qualitative questions	Worked with marketing and communications team to develop monthly newsletter and distribute Worked with marketing and creative services team to film family chat and mini family video and release Worked with family on social media family story sharing Finalized postsurvey and qualitative data questions
November 2018	1.Sent November newsletter 2. November family videos published 3. Postsurvey distributed 4. Individual interviews conducted	Worked with marketing and communications team to develop monthly newsletter and distribute Worked with marketing and creative services team to film family chat and mini family video and release Distributed of postsurvey Conducted and recorded individual interviews
December 2018	1. Data analysis	Transcribed interview audio recordings Completed coding of qualitative data Completed quantitative analysis